DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 274 UD 014 624

AUTHOR	Solomon, Robert J., Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Conferences on Improving School Effectiveness, San Francisco, California [and] Washington, D.C., May 1973.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	122p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Cost Effectiveness; Educational Finance; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Educational Problems; *Educational Quality; Public Education; *Public Policy; School Community Relationship; *School Organization; Social Values; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The contents of the proceedings of this conference on improving school effectiveness, the purpose of which was to bring together a group of speakers who, because of their outstanding work, could help clarify some of the major issues in this area and perhaps help to suggest some solutions, include the following papers: "Does Education Make a Difference?" Bernard C. Watson; "The New Skeptics Have Gone Too Far," James W. Guthrie; "Legal Influences on Education," John E. Coons; "Financing Public Education," Charles S. Benson; "Community Influences on Education," Michael W. Kirst; "Education and Social Goals," Seymour Martin Lipset; "Meeting the Needs of Minority Children," Julian Nava; "What Teachers Can Do to Improve School Effectiveness," David Selden; "New Trends in the Preparation of Teachers," Robin H. Farquhar; "Equality and Higher Education," Paul N. Ylvisaker; "State Planning for Quality Education," Russell W. Peterson; and, "NIE and School Effectiveness," Thomas K. Glennan, Jr. (Author/JM)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 098274

Proceedings of the
Conferences
on

IMPROVING SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MAY 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 098274

Sponsored by
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

ED 098274

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conferences
on

IMPROVING SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Robert J. Solomon
CHAIRMAN

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
Princeton, New Jersey · Berkeley, California · Evanston, Illinois
Copyright © 1973 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 73-85816

CONTRIBUTORS

Charles S. Benson, *Professor of Education*
University of California, Berkeley

John E. Coons, *Professor of Law*
University of California, Berkeley

Robin H. Farquhar, *Chairman*
Department of Educational Administration
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Thomas K. Glennan, Jr., *Director*
National Institute of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

James W. Guthrie, *Associate Professor of Education*
University of California, Berkeley

Michael W. Kirst, *Assistant Professor of Education*
Stanford University

Seymour Martin Lipset
Professor of Government and Social Relations
Harvard University

Julian Nava, *Professor of History*
California State University at Northridge

Russell W. Peterson, *Chairman*
Executive Committee
Commission on Third Century America

David Selden, *President*
American Federation of Teachers

Robert J. Solomon
Executive Vice President
Educational Testing Service

Bernard C. Watson, *Chairman*
Department of Urban Education
Temple University

Paul N. Ylvisaker, *Dean*
Faculty of Education
Harvard University

CONTENTS

1 Introduction
Robert J. Solomon

3 Does Education Make a Difference?
Bernard C. Watson

15 The New Skeptics Have Gone Too Far
James W. Guthrie

26 Legal Influences on Education
John E. Coons

32 Financing Public Education
Charles S. Benson

48 Community Influences on Education
Michael W. Kirst

62 Education and Social Goals
Seymour Martin Lipset

72 Meeting the Needs of Minority Children
Julian Nava

80 What Teachers Can Do to Improve School Effectiveness
David Selden

87 New Trends in the Preparation of Teachers
Robin H. Farquhar

97 Equality and Higher Education
Paul N. Ylvisaker

104 State Planning for Quality Education
Russell W. Peterson

113 NIE and School Effectiveness
Thomas K. Glennan, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

Robert J. Solomon

Improving the effectiveness of our schools is a subject that excites the interests, and often the passions, of Americans from every walk of life. The goal of universal schooling established by earlier generations has been virtually achieved by the generation of children born since the Korean War. At the present rate, in a very few years nearly all children will complete high school, and probably more than half of them will go on to some form of postsecondary education.

But universal schooling has not been the panacea that many assumed it would be. And so, from all corners have come opinions and proposals for improving the educational effectiveness, or the social effectiveness, or, perhaps more mundanely, the cost effectiveness of schools. Some have even proposed that we do away with schools entirely.

Our purpose in organizing a conference on improving school effectiveness was to bring together a group of speakers who, because of their outstanding work, could help clarify some of the major issues in this area and perhaps help to suggest some solutions. Their thoughtful presentations as recorded in this publication should serve admirably to give the reader new and useful perspectives. We are indebted to these contributors for helping us to make some order out of a subject that has frequently seemed inordinately chaotic.

DOES EDUCATION MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Bernard C. Watson

At almost any time before the present, the question of whether education makes a difference would have been unthinkable. It would have been met with suspicion, incredulity, or mystification. Does education make a difference? One might as well ask whether food or sleep or oxygen makes a difference! I can hardly express too strongly my amazement that such a question should be the subject of serious consideration by this audience.

Of course, we are not really talking about education—which is not limited to what takes place in schools—but about schooling. That is what is under discussion (one might almost say under attack) today: the whole complex process whereby children and young people are sent to certain buildings and required to spend 8 or 12 or 16 years acquiring certain skills under the direction of certain people labeled teachers.

Now we may argue, with considerable justification, about whether some schools are better than others, or we might even discuss the proposition that formal schooling as we know it is antithetical to good education. But I happen to think that the response to this is obvious. Certainly some schools are better than others. Why else would families who have the option to decide where and how their children are to be educated automatically gravitate to neighborhoods where schools have a reputation for high teaching standards, good administration, or fine facilities? Or why would well-to-do families send their youngsters, who have the benefit of every imaginable "cultural advantage" at home, to private schools nearby or to the great boarding schools such as Groton, St. Paul's, and Miss Porter's? There seems to be no question in the minds of these families about whether education makes a difference: They willingly pay exorbitant sums—in high suburban tax rates or in tuition bills, or both—to obtain the best kind of education available. And they certainly do not rely on their children's ability to simply absorb, by a kind of osmosis, the intellectual and cultural skills which they will later need to run family corporations or become successful professional men.

If we look back through history, we find no evidence to indicate that anyone has ever seriously raised the question with which we are asked to deal today. Quite the contrary. Political philosophers, beginning with Plato and Aristotle, have usually devoted much of their teaching to education,

on the assumption that the state's health and welfare depend on the proper training of the young in the duties of citizenship. Indeed, education has been seen as the key to enabling men to become fully human, to exercise their peculiarly human attribute of rationality. Similarly, religious teachers have always urged on parents their duty to train their children in the traditions and precepts of their religion. Without education, it seemed obvious that neither the church nor the state could long survive.

Think of how education has been viewed by the aspiring poor of every age and nation. Think of the stories we have all heard—some may be part of our own family history—of parents who struggled and saved and even scrimped on necessities in order to see that their youngsters made it to school, or to college, or to the university. It never occurred to them that education made "no difference"—they *knew* that it was the key to a security and status that they had never known but which their educated children could enjoy. Education has, of course, been feared by members of some ruling elites: They knew all too well that education was a liberating force which, if put in the hands of slaves and peasants, might well turn the world upside down. Rightly perceiving that education was threatening to their own designs, they burned books, closed schools and universities, and generally reserved educational opportunity to the chosen few who could be counted on to be loyal to the goals of the existing regime. Other rulers have turned education to their own ends by insisting that the young be indoctrinated with political propaganda, along with reading and arithmetic. (To an extent, all societies do this. After all, schooling is one of the primary means of socialization in every society.)

It is incredible that something that "makes no difference" should have been viewed for so long as both threat and promise, should have absorbed so much of the time and energy of so many. Whatever we are, whatever we have accomplished, is a tribute to the power of education, broadly conceived. One generation after another has absorbed the learning of the past, moved beyond it or added to it, and passed on to its children not only its own knowledge, but the thirst for more. Why, then, is the question being asked: Does education make a difference? Partly, no doubt, it is a symptom of the temper of our time—when most traditions, conventions, and commonly accepted values are subject to doubt and questioning, or are even being abandoned. But even more significant, the question is evidence of the social and political reaction which is rampant in this country at present. It is raised—scornfully by some, hesitantly or sadly by others—as a challenge to the most basic of American beliefs: the belief that through education a society of free men might have equal opportunity to

succeed in life and, even more important, to maintain control over their chosen government.

But before we explore the reasons *why* this question is being posed at this particular time and in this context, let me attempt to respond to it directly, although my distaste should by now be clear. Does education make a difference? Or, in other words, what evidence is available on the success of education in achieving its objectives? One way to approach this is to take the question apart and look at each of its key components in turn. First, what kind of "evidence" is being requested? What will satisfy the judge and jurors? I have already indicated that I believe history to be replete with examples of how education did, in fact, make all the difference. Let me remind you of the persistence with which the former slaves (and their abolitionist allies) struggled to get schools and teachers—although they were confronted at every turn by scorn, contempt, patronizing words, and outright refusals to have tax monies used for the education of former slaves. As early as 1866, the various freedmen's associations had established nearly 1,000 schools attended by some 90,000 pupils—a number which increased to almost 112,000 the following year. James McPherson, the Princeton historian, noting that "the children came from a cultural environment almost entirely devoid of intellectual stimulation," says that progress was slow—but he adds:

> The freedmen had an almost passionate desire to learn to read and write, and children laboriously taught their parents the alphabet and multiplication table during their spare time. Teachers invariably testified that despite their disadvantages in background, training, and environment, Negro children learned to read almost as well and as rapidly as white children.[1]

Despite the collapse of Reconstruction and the ensuing establishment of strict segregation and dual facilities, the proportion of the black population attending school climbed steadily. The blacks knew that education made a difference—and so did their oppressors. Gunnar Myrdal, in his classic book *The American Dilemma*, describes the abysmal conditions in Negro schools in the South during the 1930s. He writes:

> . . .Negro education still does not have a fixed legitimate acknowledged place. It is realized that something must be done in order to keep the Negro satisfied and in order to uphold the American slogan of free schools for every child, but it is rare that a community has any real interest in planning or building a wise system of education

> for the race. Politically, it is not admitted that a Negro has a right to schools. . . .[2]

Those who carefully engineered an inferior school system for blacks—a program whose nature and extent has been well documented not only by Myrdal, but by such other scholars as Ambrose Caliver, Horace Mann Bond, and Henry Allen Bullock—whether in the rural South or urban North knew very well the power and liberating force inherent in education. Had schooling been made available to the black child on the same terms as to the white, the myth of his inferiority would very quickly have been shattered.

Yet many of the youngsters did manage to complete this inadequate schooling and went on to the black colleges, which for the last century have provided almost the sole opportunity for higher or professional education available to blacks. Indeed, as late as 1969, Meharry and Howard were educating all but a tiny number of our black medical and dental students, and 27 percent of all black law students were enrolled in four black schools.[3] Without these institutions, the black community would have been almost completely without medical and legal services—which are still much scarcer for minorities than for the white population of this country. Let me ask you again—how is it possible to entertain the possibility that education makes no difference? The oppressed and ignorant slaves knew better—and generations of their descendants, whether themselves graduates of universities or simply beneficiaries of the specialized training of fellow blacks, know better.

Similarly, the thousands upon thousands of immigrants who came to these shores, fleeing from famine and oppression elsewhere, counted on education to break down language barriers, to help them adapt to the customs and culture of their newly adopted land. And whether in formal or informal settings, these people, and even more their children, quickly (though not always without pain and stress) adopted American ways. What evidence do we have that education succeeds? They would point to their sons and grandsons who, within a few years, began to take their places as respected citizens, landowners, professional men in the new country.

If you prefer another kind of evidence, why not recall the critical role education has played in meeting various national goals? In wartime, for instance, we trained workers without previous factory experience (many of them housewives and adolescents) to operate complex machinery; we taught youthful officers to become fluent in another language in only weeks; we developed jets and rockets and the atom bomb; we taught crass

youth to build, operate, and maintain the most complicated equipment in the history of man. Our feelings about war may be more ambiguous now than in the 1940s when we were in a desperate race with time and the most efficient and educated war machine ever established. Without the determination and ability to educate our people to meet the crisis, history might have run a very different course.

More pacific evidence can be found, however, in the history of agriculture: Five percent of the population of this country feeds the other 95 percent. The fantastically high standard of living enjoyed in this country could not have been achieved had we not discovered how to provide for this most basic of human needs—food. It was not done by accident, but through education: Think of the role played by the land-grant colleges, the agricultural extension stations and labs, the field agents, who trained farmers in new methods and machinery by which they could increase their land's yield. In other parts of the world today, we hear of the "green revolution"—discoveries from scientists which are helping to destroy the ancient spectre of famine. Agricultural education has already accomplished much in some of the Third World countries—and now that indigenous farmers have learned to operate modern equipment, they require further education in order to be able to maintain it.

I hardly need to mention the space programs, so clear is the relationship to education. A single space shot, the Russian Sputnik, was responsible for more curriculum changes in this country than any other single event. And in turn, the graduates of our science programs—engineering, biology, chemistry, and a host of other specialities whose names I don't even know—succeeded within 10 short years in breaking the barrier between man and the moon. What evidence do we have about the difference made by education? What more evidence do we need?

If statistical evidence is more convincing, that, too, can be provided. Henry Levin, Stanford economist, and his colleagues put together a study not long ago for the Mondale Committee—and calculated that inadequate education (which they defined as less than high school completion) for working-age males in this country would cost, over their lifetimes, some $237 billion in lost income, $71 billion in lost tax monies, and some $6 billion in costs for welfare and prison.[4] And just the other day the Census Bureau published a survey establishing the relationships between level of education completed and earning power. The mean annual incomes for each group ranged from $5,950 for those with less than 8 years of schooling to $16,698 for those with 4 or more years of college.[5] These aren't theories, or models, or somebody's projections: These are facts,

culled out from the fantastic masses of data collected by the government to let us know what is actually happening.

Let me move on to the second key word in the question: "success." How is "success" to be defined? We really can't talk about success in the abstract, because it has to be connected with something else—namely, the objectives we deem appropriate for education. In an admirable move toward defining educational objectives more precisely, we frequently require teachers to specify their goals in behavioral terms, so that we can measure the extent to which they have succeeded or not. But educators often lose sight of the broader role played by the educational system in our society. We take it for granted (although again I must remind myself that perhaps we no longer do take it for granted) that education is the chief, if not the only, means whereby people prepare for some jobs, increase their income, move upward socially, and participate in democratic affairs. Yet there are also the "latent functions" of the vast educational systems: to provide a place and activities for those too young to enter on a career; to keep them out of mischief and off the streets; to look after them while parents (and increasingly *both* parents) are at work outside the home, either from necessity or from choice. Some of the more romantic educational philosophers, of course, see and condemn these "latent functions" of education—but they seem very ill prepared, despite the flow of rhetoric about schools as prisons, to present workable alternatives for the care and supervision of millions of children.

And let us not forget the schools as employers. They provide jobs and income and status for millions of people—and, for the poor and minorities in particular, a major opportunity for upward mobility. If we were to consider education's success only in performing these latent functions, then our task would be relatively simple. At present, almost all youngsters under 16 *are* in school, off the streets, and out of the factories. And the few exceptions—children of migrant workers or urban dropouts—are cause for particular concern just because they are exceptions. The school systems, as caretakers of the young and as key employers, are certainly making a difference.

But what about the specifically educational functions? We have all been in conversations where someone launched into a tirade about what the schools should be doing, or what would happen if they would just start doing something else. What do people have in mind when they think of educational "success," even in a vague and general way? Sometimes they seem to mean that we would have total employment. Everyone would be working, no one would be on welfare—if the schools were successful.

Others seem to have visions, similar to those of the old utilitarians, of universal happiness: no riots, no unrest, no apathy, no alienation—everybody happy. Is that what is meant by success when education is being evaluated? Or are we interested in the relationship between schooling and citizenship, and do we judge successful education, therefore, on the basis of statistics about participation in the last election? Of course, we might feel that education should produce cultured people—and we would then measure success by sales of books, or attendance at cultural events, or amount of amateur activity in the arts, crafts, music, and dance.

Obviously, it's not possible to make sense of "success" without specifying education's objectives—but first we must consider the third key word in our question, namely "education." Well, here again we have to ask, what is meant by "education"? Obviously there is a distinction between formal and informal education—and few would deny the critical importance of what is learned informally, in families, over the airwaves, on the streets, in movie houses. Some people, in fact, regard this type of learning as so important, so "meaningful" or "relevant," they would have us abandon the schools so that everyone might devote himself to such informal learning. But we are here concerned with formal education: that which takes place, for the most part, in special buildings under the guidance of specially trained personnel. Still, we need to ask again specifically what is meant when we use the word "education." Are we referring to public or private or parochial education? To elementary, secondary, or higher education? To liberal arts or vocational education? And when these questions have been answered, we must still know what kinds of schools we're talking about: rich or poor, in what part of the country, rural or urban? And what kind of atmosphere is in them: mindless or purposeful, permissive or rigidly structured, loving or tension-ridden?

Sloppy writing or speech, old-fashioned English teachers would say, is a sign of sloppy thinking—and I heartily concur, when I hear people ask questions about "education" as though that conveyed to me in and of itself a crystal clear concept which I could then discuss. "Define your terms" has been the first rule for debate since men began to argue, but we still avoid doing so all too often—not least of the reasons being that it is so much easier to talk in generalities, to talk about "Society" or "The Economy". . . or, as here, "Education."

As I noted a moment ago, "success" in education, as in any other enterprise, is inextricably tied up with "objectives." It is not possible to discuss educational success without reference to educational objectives,

goals, and purposes. And although Professor Lipset will develop this point more fully this afternoon, let me mention just two of the most important objectives of the educational process: socializing the individual, and making him at the same time self-sufficient.

Societies have used their formal educational systems to socialize the young—that is, to indoctrinate them with the values and standards of the group, to teach them to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable behavior, to give them a sense of pride in the history and traditions of their country. In other words, the young have to learn—and do, to a greater or lesser degree—that they are and will always be dependent on one another. But simultaneously they must also learn to be independent: to develop an identity, a feeling of self-worth, and skills and abilities which will allow them to reach their personal goals. So the broadest objectives of education—socialization and individual self-sufficiency—are frequently in contradiction. But the tension between them can be a creative tension. As the student learns about his group, his society, and his country, he also learns to reflect on them, and as he reflects, he criticizes. It is significant that reform, rebellion, and revolution have so often been sponsored and led by students.

Does education make a difference? Practically everybody I know would be surprised to know that this question is being asked, let alone seriously considered, by this distinguished group of people. Certainly the minority group members of this society would be astonished. So would the poor, in Appalachia or in the heart of any one of our cities. So would the immigrants to these shores. And farmers and space scientists and oceanographers.

Restating the question doesn't help very much, either. We have looked at another version—What evidence is available of the success of education in meeting its objectives?—and we have seen that each of the key terms is so imprecise that the question as a whole is almost meaningless.

And so I return to a point I made at the beginning of these remarks: *Why* is the question being raised at this particular juncture? If we understand the context for the question, I think we may see it for what it is worth, suitably ignore it, and spend our energies on the more precise, and more exacting, problems which confront the educational community. Let me attempt, then, to sketch that context.

Education has been the focus of the struggle and efforts over the past 20 years—dating from the 1954 Brown decision—to rectify racial injustice and to eradicate the blight of poverty in this country. No institution has been the subject of as much criticism, attack, concern, and activity as the

public schools: We need not recount here the series of battles over desegregation, curriculum reform, functional illiteracy, community control, and innovations of various sorts. The point is that public education has been ordered by judicial fiat, urged by concerned citizens, and persuaded by federal and foundation funds to change its ways—and the successive waves of change have left in their wake a residue of discontent, frustration, and resentment. Frustration that so little has been accomplished, and resentment at the dislocations and expense. We had hoped, like the medieval alchemists, to find the magic potion which would make education golden, and instead we have concocted a witches' brew of militancy, anger, and misunderstanding which threatens to destroy public education as we have known it. It might have been possible—it *should* have been possible—to view our half-successes and even our failure with equanimity, to exert that typically American pragmatism which meets disaster philosophically and turns men to devising better schemes even while the debris of disaster is still being cleared away. Certainly, not all the programs to improve education were well planned; most were not given enough time to work; none was funded adequately (despite the current rhetoric about the "massive" amounts of federal aid which have been poured into education). But such facts might, once, have simply been taken as evidence that we needed to work harder at the task.

Tragically, we have taken another road—that of defeatism and despair. Apparently we have decided—we who conquered the wilderness and made the desert to bloom and put men on the moon—that some problems are incapable of being solved, that all our billions and our expertise are, at last, helpless when it comes to teaching a poor black or Chicano child to read or to find a job. A failure of nerve in a formerly fearless man is a sad thing—but it is forgivable, it is understandable, it can be overcome. What is obscene about our present situation is the incredible willingness of many people—encouraged by our national leaders—to justify our failures by blaming the victims of them. As if in response to society's basest instincts, the new sorcerers and shamans have stolen into our midst to offer once again theories of genetic inferiority, concepts of a culture of poverty which keeps people from emerging from their self-induced misery, and warnings about the limits on what government can rightfully be expected to accomplish. Contributions from such various fields as psychology, sociology, and political science have been carefully orchestrated into a full-scale "scientific" rationale for the slackening or abandonment of national efforts to redress the grievances of the poor, or the oppressed. (As a matter of fact, I have examined this phenomenon at much greater length

in a monograph just published by the National Urban Coalition.)[6]

Since education has been the focus of so many of our earlier programs—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Economic Opportunity Act, to name only two—it is hardly surprising that education should be the object of a key line of attack. The chief spokesman, of course, is Christopher Jencks. Backed by the prestige of academia and foundations, armed with statistical analyses churned out by his infallible computers, surrounded by the spotlights of national media coverage, Mr. Jencks has informed us that schools don't matter. Luck, personality—things we can't do anything about, by definition—turn out to be the magic ingredients in the formula for success in life, but the quantity or quality of education to which one is exposed is all but irrelevant. Need I remind you that we live in a "credential society"? However narrow or crass a view of education this may seem to entail, it is obvious that a major objective of each level of education is to prepare students for the next level. Whatever we may feel about the abuses of the whole complicated system of credits, certification, and credentials, there is no escaping the reality: No one is going to get into law school without presenting evidence of having completed high school.

In the face of common sense, philosophy, and the accumulated experience of mankind, here stands Jencks, like Coleman before him, to tell us that all this time we have been barking up the wrong tree. Schools don't matter. Mr. Jencks, as you may know, has expressed his dismay that his findings have been utilized as a rationale for educational retrenchment and retreat. After all, he is a leading proponent of egalitarianism, and his book was intended as a call to equalizing income—he just happens to believe that it will not be achieved by improving educational opportunity. But he and his colleagues cannot escape the responsibility for the "unanticipated consequences" of his work. Clearly, his recent book has become an integral part of what *Social Policy* called the "new assault on equality," one more justification for the current administration's policy of dismantling many Great Society efforts and cutting back on spending for social welfare and educational programs. Small wonder that educators, parents, and concerned citizens, who have lived through years of controversy about the schools, churned up by militant unions, angry students, or such radical thinkers as Ivan Illich, are now thoroughly confused and disillusioned. Small wonder that those who have fought and argued and worked to find more equitable ways to fund our educational system are disheartened to learn from the Supreme Court that education is not among the rights afforded explicit or implicit protection under the Constitution.

Small wonder, after all, that this distinguished audience should be gathered to ponder whether education makes a difference.

Does education make a difference? Of course it does. There will always be arguments—and there should be—about specific issues connected with our schools. Some people will always feel that they are expected to do too much, while others believe that they are not doing enough. Unfortunately, the greatest danger is not in the argument, but in the temptation to short-circuit it by looking for simplistic analyses and simplistic solutions. One example of this kind of thinking is found among those who profess great interest in studying genetic inferiority. All too readily, they would write off certain groups as incapable of profiting from academic education and dictate for them an "easier" curriculum, one "in keeping" with their abilities.

But this country was founded—and its integrity depends—on the profound belief in the worth of each individual and in his right to decide for himself how far and how fast he will move: economically, socially, culturally, politically. We have already witnessed far too much loss and pain and damage from the frustration and suppression of individual talent. Are we now to hand over the educational decision-making power to those who claim on the basis of science or statistics to "know" what is best for entire segments of the population? I am certainly not ready to do so, given the serious deficiencies of much of educational research, the inescapable bias of much of what is advertised as "objective" or "value-free" findings, the strange correlation between political strategies and social theories.

But perhaps, after all, asking the question of whether education makes a difference will serve a useful purpose. Perhaps it will force us to face the inadequate and even disastrous conditions of much of what passes for education in this country. Perhaps it will encourage us to begin defining more precisely just what difference we want education to make. Perhaps it will encourage us to demand of educators and politicians alike that we begin in this country to devote to education, particularly basic and elementary education, the same energy and money and determination which helped us conquer the wilderness, win wars, or put a man on the moon.

I hope those here today will refuse to be distracted from what can and ought to be done; will spend no more time discussing a question to which we all know the answer; and will get on with the difficult, demanding, but honorable and essential task of seeing that education *does* make a difference, a worthwhile and satisfying difference, to each of America's children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

1. James M. McPherson, *The Struggle for Equality* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964), p. 394.

2. Quoted by A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., "American Education and an Open Society: 'So Many Deeds Cry Out to be Done,'" reprinted from *Monograph Nine: College/Career Choice: Right Student, Right Time, Right Place* (Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1973), pp. 66-67.

3. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *From Isolation to Mainstream: Problems of the Colleges Founded for Negroes* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), pp. 31-32.

4. Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *The Costs to the Nation of Inadequate Education* (Washington: GPO, 1972), p. ix.

5. *Career Trends* (A newsletter of the Career Services Office of Temple University), April 20, 1973, p. 5.

6. Bernard C. Watson, *Stupidity, Sloth & Public Policy: Social Darwinism Rides Again* (Washington: National Urban Coalition, May 15, 1973).

THE NEW SKEPTICS HAVE GONE TOO FAR

James W. Guthrie

One of the benefits of science is to free us from falsehoods which masquerade as conventional wisdom. In this fashion, for example, we now know that neither is the earth flat nor is it the center of the universe. However, science itself is not infallible.

For example, inaccurate measurement and premature acceptance of findings in the instance of the "Piltdown Man" led to vastly distorted calculations regarding the age and formation of man. Similarly, ideological assumptions led the Russian biologist Lysenko to argue incorrectly that manipulation of the environment could lead to the inheritability of physical traits. Soviet agriculture has still not recovered fully from the effects of this error.

The point is that the interpretation of scientific findings calls for a balanced perspective. It is not only morally wrong to foreclose a particular line of systematic investigation, but also it may prove practically shortsighted.[1] It simply is impossible to predict the future benefits that might flow from a particular line of study On the other side of the ledger, it is equally foolish blindly to accept findings which appear to contradict long accepted truths.

A group of contemporary social scientists has been questioning conventional wisdom regarding schools and the effectiveness of education. In effect, they ask: "What do schools teach? Is it the school or the pupil's home environment which leads to academic achievement? Regardless of the source from which it comes, what difference does education make anyway?" These researchers, best exemplified by James S. Coleman, Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, and Christopher Jencks,[2] are themselves frequently quite cautious about the validity and meaning of their findings. However, many of their disciples and interpreters are less restrained. As a consequence, a new skepticism has grown regarding the effectiveness of education as a treatment for society's ills.

If such skepticism were confined to the social scientist's laboratory or computer center, then it would present no particular danger. Indeed, a doubting posture is probably crucial for uncovering truth. The difficulty, however, is that this skepticism over the effectiveness of schooling increasingly is serving as the basis for public policy. The schools' alleged

lack of effectiveness has been used to justify a reduction in federal school aid. The brakes are being applied to school expenditures at the state level for similar reasons. Even the U.S. Supreme Court has used flawed school effectiveness research findings as a base for its decision in the school finance case, *Rodriguez v. San Antonio Independent School District.*[3]

At this point in time, the state of the art regarding school effectiveness research is too crude to provide valid answers. We cannot prove definitely that schools make a difference, that particular instructional techniques are effective, or that additional resources can be arranged to bring added increments of student achievement. Present scientific techniques simply cannot confirm conventional wisdom concerning the importance of schooling and education. Conversely, and more important, present methodological limitations do not permit definitive statements regarding the ineffectiveness of schools. Therefore, it would be the highest folly to abandon Western civilization's deep belief in the utility of formal education, on the basis of Coleman Report findings or conclusions from the Jencks volume. However, unless policy-makers and the informed public can better understand the limitations of present research, there is a substantial probability that our nation's historic commitment to public schooling will be severely eroded.

The primary purpose of this paper is to sensitize readers to the flawed nature of the existing line of school effectiveness research and to promote a counter movement. Such a movement, hopefully, would itself not be guilty of excesses; it would not claim more for schools than can be proved or reasonably believed. However, it would not blindly accept and act upon the unsupported contention that education makes no difference.

The Imperfect State of the Present Art

The previously referred to Coleman Report continues to serve as the data gathering and analytic backbone supporting most current school effectiveness research efforts. Consequently, it makes sense to focus upon the Coleman Report and describe its flaws. Many of the weaknesses from which it suffers also characterize the Mosteller and Moynihan volume and the work of Jencks and others.

The Origin and Purposes of the Coleman Report

In the course of Congressional hearings and floor debates over the 1964 Civil Rights Act, it became evident that little was known regarding the

equity, or inequity, with which school services were made available to students of various racial, ethnic, and social-class groups. Consequently, Section 402 of the Act called for a

> . . . report of the President and the Congress within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

In October of 1964, Congress passed the 1965 Supplemental Appropriations Act, which contained $2 million for conducting the study. Thereafter, James S. Coleman, a number of individuals from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) in the U.S. Office of Education, and consultants from Educational Testing Service and several universities began the task of designing the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey and the other research studies which would later comprise the Coleman Report. The completed document was issued in late summer of 1966, less than two years after the project was begun. By almost any standard, it was a massive report, two volumes with tables and appendices totaling more than 1,200 pages.

Criticisms of the Coleman Report

One of the strongest criticisms[4] directed at the Coleman team's efforts is that it simply tried too much, given the time and resource constraints within which it had to operate. The attempt to conduct research about equality of inputs, equality of outcomes, and the relationship between the resources caused the efforts to be spread too thinly. The policy utility of the resulting document was severely compromised by the breadth of the research effort and financial limitations. In addition, there is a substantial body of critical literature which faults the Coleman team for their methodological and analytical procedures. These will serve as the focal point here.

Technical criticisms can be placed into three categories: (a) those relating to the adequacy of the sample and nonresponse rates, (b) doubts concerning the validity and completeness of the questions asked on the survey instruments, and (c) appropriateness of the statistical procedure used in analyzing data relating school inputs to student performance.

Sampling and Response—The sampling problem centers primarily upon the lack of response by a sizeable number of schools, teachers, administrators, and students. Instead of obtaining information from 4,000 schools as intended, usable data were gathered for only 3,155. The effective size of the student sample was similarly reduced. Instead of the planned sample of 900,000 pupils, adequate responses were obtained for only 645,000. This is a large number, particularly when compared to the 3,000 or 4,000 person samples from which national public opinion surveys frequently operate. Consequently, the Coleman Report reader can be lulled falsely into believing that large sample size will swamp problems of nonresponse or sample bias. What must be remembered is that the number of schools involved (not only the number of students) directly affects the validity of the sample. For example, the value attached to the variable "age of school building" is assigned to every pupil in that building. Thus, for many analyses, the effective sample is the number of schools involved, *not* the number of pupils.

If no systematic bias existed in the way in which schools and their personnel chose not to respond, then absence of 30 percent or more of the sample schools might still result in an acceptable research design. However, nonresponse may not have been random. For instance, it is known that school boards and superintendents in several major central cities refused to participate, despite sincere promises that no comparisons would be made between school districts and no data would be "leaked." The possibility exists then that big-city schools, students, and personnel are underrepresented in the Coleman Report sample. Also, the seemingly large number of sample schools, 3,155, is itself somewhat deceptive when it is realized that these schools must be fitted into sample subsets such as metropolitan/nonmetropolitan, geographic region, and grade level. Thus, as seen by at least one set of Report critics, the sample for twelfth-grade schools in the metropolitan South was based on only 78 schools. These critics state that "61 percent of 1,170 high schools included in the original sample could not be included in the analysis. Moreover, only 74 percent of the sample of feeder schools selected for the responding 689 high schools were included in the final analysis."[5]

In addition to nonresponse by schools, even when individual students, teachers, and administrators in a school did choose to respond, they did not always do so completely. Nonresponse was particularly a problem when questions touched upon sensitive areas. For example, Kain and Hanuschek state: "In a sample of about 300 elementary schools in the Northeast region. . ., over one-third of the principals failed to answer one

or more of these questions."[6] The questions to which they refer asked for principals' views regarding racial composition of school faculties. Clearly, such examples of internal nonresponse to survey items could bias results sharply. Thus, there is a problem regarding the external validity of the Coleman Report; can its findings be taken as representative of schools in America? This question can be answered more fully by examining several other facets of the Report.

Questions and Survey Procedures–The second category of technical criticisms centers around the appropriateness of content and form of the survey questions. In this regard, Kain and Hanuschek write:

> The absence of questions with any qualitative bite is particularly noticeable. There are many questions which relate to the presence of particular attributes, but few that relate to their quality.[7]

Somewhat more condemning is the statement by Edmund Gordon:

> School factors may have been found to be of relatively modest importance for all pupils not because what the schools can do is not crucial but because. . . (the study) did not look at what the schools actually do.[8]

These criticisms reflect the difficulty of survey research. The Equal Educational Opportunity Survey did not collect information regarding student achievement from two separate points in time. Rather, it administered achievement tests to school children only once. This meant that it was impossible to assess whether or not a student had gained knowledge over what he knew when he entered the particular school or grade in question. Thus, the Coleman team approach only permitted the assessment of a student's learning relative to another student, not relative to where he himself stood before the "treatment" of school. The absence of such longitudinal measures severely restricts the degree to which one can assert that the student did or did not learn in school.

While it is possible by questionnaire to obtain information regarding a teacher's years of teaching experience, alma mater, and verbal ability, the same cannot be said for items such as "ability to motivate students," the degree to which an instructor provides a strong positive adult model with which his or her pupils can identify, or whether or not the teacher actually matches instruction to the needs and ability levels of each pupil. In the absence of information regarding such process variables, the Report relied on what researchers label "status variables" such as those exemplified

above (age, sex, etc.). These are inadequate measures for what teachers do or should do in classrooms.

In addition to an absence of longitudinal measures and queries regarding instructional processes, the Report simply obtained inaccurate information from some questions. For example, superintendents were asked to state the average annual dollars spent per pupil in their districts. The analysis done with this item of information results in a finding that dollars have little or no explanatory power in accounting for the differences in student achievement. Critics have reacted unfavorably to the use of expenditure information in the form in which it was gathered by the Report since it represents a districtwide average and thereby masks the range in per pupil expenditures which typically occurs within a district.[9] For example, almost every district contains schools which teachers view as being "desirable" and others which are viewed as being "undesirable" places in which to work. Teachers with seniority (and higher salaries) tend to transfer to the desirable schools, leaving new teachers and long-term substitutes (those with lower salaries) to occupy the undesirable schools. When the differences in teachers' salaries between schools are taken into account, this can mean a substantial difference in per pupil expenditures. Also, there typically are very large expenditure differences in a district between primary and secondary schools. To take a districtwide average is to disguise such differences.[10]

Another facet of the survey technique which casts doubt upon the Report's results is the self-report nature of the questionnaires. Students were asked questions regarding their parents' education level and occupation, the answers to which it is conceivable they did not know accurately. Teachers were asked questions about themselves such as number of years of schooling, salary, or degrees; there was a possible temptation to falsify the response. Moreover, teachers' verbal facility was measured by a self-administered vocabulary test.

Recently, yet another criticism has emerged in this general area. The Report strongly stated the possibility that minority group students did less well in school because they did not feel that scholarly prowess had much bearing upon one's life. Rather such students felt, or so the Report states, that their life was beyond their own control and influenced more by caprice than hard work. Research by Kleinfeld casts doubt on the validity of the fate control finding itself. Her thesis is that the EEOS fate control questions were lacking in content validity; despite the Report's intent, the questions appear to come closer to measuring academic confidence than "fate control."[11]

Statistical Procedures – The third level of technical criticism was first enunciated in print by Samuel S. Bowles and Henry M. Levin in their two articles in the *Journal of Human Resources*.[12] The issue here surrounds the fact that the Report's authors employed a form of statistical analysis which is inappropriate if there exists a high degree of intercorrelation among "independent" (input) variables. The Coleman Report attempted to explain variance in achievement scores by successively adding different independent variables to a regression analysis. The outcomes of this approach are highly sensitive to the order in which the explanatory variables were entered, whenever the explanatory variables are interrelated.[13]

Coleman Report measures of socioeconomic conditions and school services are highly interrelated and do not meet the criterion of independence. The argument here is that high quality school services tend to be made available to students from higher socioeconomic strata and lower quality school services to students from low socioeconomic strata. If in a regression analysis, "independent" variables are in fact highly intercorrelated, whichever variable cluster (socioeconomic status or school services) is first placed in the equation will have the higher explanatory power. The first entered cluster will have exhausted the major portion of whatever variance exists to be explained by the total of the two variable clusters together. The analysis involved in the Coleman Report chose to place socioeconomic status variables into the equation first; not unexpectedly they "discovered" that this cluster explained substantially more variance than did the school service cluster. Had they reversed the entry position of the two clusters, they would have found schools to be the major contributor to pupil performance.[14]

The reason given for entering pupils' social background characteristics into the regression equation ahead of school service variables reveals the lack of thought, probably because of lack of time, given to planning the Report's analyses.

> Since the student's background is clearly prior to, and independent of, any influence from school factors, these background factors can and should be held constant in studying the effects of school variables. Thus, the variation in achievement and attitudes to be explained by school variables is that left after variation explained by family background differences is taken out.[15]

There are numerous other smaller methodological errors which appear in the Report. For example, students who had transferred from one school

to another tended to be matched with the characteristics of their present school, even if they had been there for only a few days. Also, it has been found by subsequent analyses of the EEOS questionnaires that the non-response of students to certain questions is not random. One could continue in this vein for some time. However, hopefully the point regarding the Report's flawed methodology is already clear.

What Needs to be Done?

How can the problems provoked by the excesses of the new skepticism be overcome? A successful counter effort will need at least two components: one within the political domain and another within the realm of the researcher.

On the political front, action is needed to refocus and reaffirm the importance of education in the eye of the public. One idea worth exploring is the proposal for a "Bicentennial Commission on the Future of American Education." Such a Commission, hopefully nonpartisan and composed of both laymen and educators of extraordinary prestige, should be charged with plotting the course of American education until the year 2000. If properly done, drawing upon the best staff and operating in the mode of a British Royal Commission, this venture could do much to reinstill public confidence in the utility of schooling.[16]

In the research realm we need to pursue an entirely new strategy. It no longer is sufficient to correct for the mistakes of Coleman Report type research. Rather, instead of cross-sectional, survey research, a series of experiments should be designed. These would possess the usual experimental comparative purposes, pre- and post-test measures, etc. Moreover, each experiment should represent an explicit instructional theory. In this way, not only would we learn whether or not schooling can make a difference, but also we would obtain better information regarding what kind of schooling makes the most difference.[17]

Conclusion

Within the last decade, a line of social science inquiry has been undertaken which seriously questions long-held views regarding the effectiveness of formal education. These research findings may eventually be substantiated. If so, then as a nation we could come to rely upon institutions other than

schools to perform functions such as political socialization and cultural transmission.

Nevertheless, at the moment, the procedures employed in school effectiveness research are so flawed as to cast an enormous shadow of doubt over the findings. Regrettably, this doubt has not properly been communicated widely, and the result has been that the public generally and policy-makers particularly have all too frequently been willing to use it to make negative judgments.

The danger in this position is at least twofold. On the one hand, the restriction of resources for schools may in fact begin to reduce their effectiveness. On the other hand, a far more subtle phenomenon may begin to take place. Educators may come to doubt their effectiveness so seriously as to create a self-fulfilling situation. Believing that education does not matter, they may begin to act in a fashion which guarantees that it doesn't. The "jury is still out" on the question of school effectiveness, and while it is, the wise position, in this instance, is for policy-makers to adhere to conventional wisdom. Until our information base is vastly improved, we should abide by the traditional view that schooling *can* make a difference. Not to do so, in the event the new skeptics are proved wrong, might have an extraordinarily negative effect upon our educational system specifically and the society generally.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

[1] Assuming, of course, that it is conducted in a humane fashion.

[2] James S. Coleman *et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966); Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds., *On Equality of Educational Opportunity* (New York: Random House, 1972); and Christopher Jencks *et al. Inequality. A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

[3] ___ U.S. ___, 93 S. Ct. 1278, ___ L. Ed. 2nd ___, 1973.

[4] For the reader who desires a more comprehensive review of these criticisms, the following articles and book best illustrate the allegations made regarding the Report's shortcomings: Samuel S. Bowles and Henry M. Levin, "The Determinants of Scholastic Achievement, An Appraisal of Some Recent Evidence," *Journal of Human Resources* 3, Winter 1968, pp. 1-23; James W. Guthrie *et al. Schools and Inequality* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1971); Samuel S. Bowles and Henry M. Levin, "More on Multicollinearity and the Effectiveness of Schools," *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. III, No. 3, Summer 1968, pp. 393-400; John F. Kain and Eric A. Hanushek, "On the Value of Equal Educational Opportunity as a Guide to Public Policy," Discussion paper No. 36 for the Program on Regional and Urban Economics, (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1968); Glen Cain and Harold W. Watts, "Problems in Making Policy Inferences from the Coleman Report," an unpublished paper from the Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin. Criticisms of the Mosteller-Moynihan book are contained in James W. Guthrie and Thomas C. Thomas, "Policy Implications of the Coleman Report Reanalyses I," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May 1973. Criticism of the Jencks volume is provided by Henry M. Levin in "The Social Science Objectivity Gap," *Saturday Review/Education*, November 11, 1972, pp. 49-51.

[5] Kain and Hanushek, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[8] Gordon is quoted in Meyer Weinberg, *Desegregation Research: An Appraisal*. (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1970), Second Edition, p. 292.

[9] For added evidence on this point, see Charles E. Hansen, "Central City and Suburb: A Study of Educational Opportunity," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969).

[10] This is not even to engage in the discussion of *budget costs versus audited* expenditures per pupil as a criticism. Meyer Weinberg contends, probably correctly, that there typically is a substantial difference, school by school, in what is budgeted at the beginning of a year and what actually is spent. Weinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 290, 292.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[11]Judith Kleinfeld, "Sense of Fate Control and Community Control of the Schools," *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. III, No. 3, May 1971, pp. 277-300.

[12]Bowles and Levin, *op. cit.*

[13]Here again, an even more basic kind of criticism can be made. Regression analysis assumes that each additional input variable relates to the educational process in some linear fashion. This is highly questionable.

[14]This is exactly what several other researchers (e.g., Bowles and Levin, *op. cit.*) did, in order to demonstrate the faults in this approach, and, indeed, they found the expected results. When entered first, school service variables explained a greater proportion of the variance.

[15]James S. Coleman *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 330.

[16]Needless to say, there would be substantial advantages to having such a Commission's report timed coincidentally with many of the other bicentennial activities being planned for 1976.

[17]One would hope that the newly created National Institute of Education would envision research of this nature as falling within it charge.

LEGAL INFLUENCES ON EDUCATION

John E. Coons

The title assigned me is gloriously broad, and I gratefully accept the implied license to emphasize whatever I please. Today what I please is to suggest broadly that law has played a schizophrenic and, for the most part, dependent role in shaping the institutions and the milieu of public education. Like the sometimes well-intentioned elites who fashion it, the law has never fully decided whether its mission is the education or the subjugation of the common man. This ambivalence could be demonstrated with a variety of examples ranging from scrimmages over students' classroom rights, on through racial discrimination, and even to the subtler issues of value indoctrination. Here, however, I shall focus principally upon the ambiguous roles of two interdependent legal phenomena—compulsory education and the familiar local property tax. Following Aristotle, I shall put the story in three parts. First, I will describe the apparent purposes (at least the obvious empirical consequences) of these legal siblings; second, I will advert to the seeming legitimation of their roles by the United States Supreme Court; third, I will speculate a bit about the law's probable future influence upon these problems and some related miscellany.

The original linking of compulsory education to a fiscal system based upon local property wealth is most easily explained as a natural extension of usages long familiar in state government. I doubt that the machinery was consciously designed to submerge the poor. The 19th century reformers declared quite the opposite, and no doubt most were sincere. At the same time we can appreciate that the Brahmins who planned the enterprise sensed its potential for controlling immigrant masses whose cultures they perceived as barbarian. Further, we are only beginning to see how easily these reformers became the handmaidens of entrepreneurs who viewed public education as a potential source of skilled—but also gelded and unthreatening—labor.

In any event, if the objective of the undertaking had been to liberate the children of the average family, the design of public education was curious indeed. By legislating each school's dependence upon district property wealth, the law insured the kind of financial chaos which in fact emerged—that is, property-rich districts spending high with low taxes and property-poor districts spending low with high taxes. Then, because the

law compelled a child's attendance in the district of his residence, those living in poor districts are designated the official victims of this discrimination machine. Finally, while *Pierce vs. Society of Sisters* eventually assured that those families rich enough to afford private schools could escape being immured, their numbers were automatically reduced by the exactions of the property tax itself.

The overall outcome was this: The average family was stuck with the local public school. If that school by accident were adequately financed, well and good–good, that is, if the family happened to prefer the public curriculum. If the local district were impoverished, the average family was both stuck with the public gospel and forced to endure it dished out in a third-rate school; as a final insult, such families were forced to pay an inflated property tax rate.

This special American version of bedlam has survived, but not because nothing better was imaginable. Reformers since 1900 have offered alternative systems. Some of these have been centralizing proposals that would altogether eliminate local taxes; some have been decentralized systems which merely equalize the *capacity* of school districts to raise money. The more radical (or conservative?) reformers would even begin to give the poor and average family some control over its educational fate through systems of subsidized family choice including, in most schemes, both public and private schools (a theme to which I'll return). The difficulty, then, was not lack of ideas, but structural political impasse. It has never been clearly to the interest of the voters in school districts of average wealth to support the necessary changes. Since these districts could not depend on a larger expenditure on schools, they had nothing to gain. The most prominent reformers, Dr. Conant for example, seemed bent upon centralizing funding, threatening these middle-wealth districts with loss of control over their budgets. Thus, no legislative majority has ever been–or could be–assembled for basic fiscal reform. The analogy to the reapportionment of the franchise is obvious. There are, no doubt, objections to this hypothesis–and it is only hypothesis–but I have yet to see them empirically supported.

This brings us to Act II of the drama. This was originally conceived as a sequence in which the legislative Prometheus is unbound by a black-robed hero and thunders forth to supply man with educational fire, wheel, and sundry other liberations of mind and spirit. In short, the judiciary was to unleash the creative energies of the state legislature.

Somehow this metaphor was lost on the Supreme Court. In *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez* the majority opinion

by Justice Powell assures us that the legislative Prometheus already is loose among us and that it is the plaintiffs who would bind him. I won't say here that Powell was wrong in describing the technical law of the case; I incline, indeed, to the unpretentious (perhaps unscrupulous) view that the Constitution is what five men say it is. What I do reject is the majority's cloaking itself in the mantle of judicial restraint and posing as friends of legislative discretion. What the Court has restrained, in fact, is the inchoate creativity of dozens of legislatures that had heard the liberating message of *Serrano v. Priest* and were expecting—in many cases hoping—for a similar deliverance from the federal high court.

The legislators who inhabit the state capitols were not noticeably different from most of us. They do good when they can manage it without serious inconvenience—such as losing office. The legislator who cries reform in a wilderness may well be invited to remain there. The *Serrano* rule offered a nearly riskless opportunity to such aspirant reformers. In the reformers' apologies to the rich districts, the Court could be cited as the villain without at the same time eliminating the possibility of playing hero to the poor. This is apparently what occurred in Kansas in response to the decree of a state court interpreting the local constitution. Once the court had accepted responsibility for eliminating the old system, basic reform was relatively easy. The final vote wasn't even close.

Remember, in all this the outcome sought in *Rodriguez* was no more than "fiscal neutrality." This is the very limited notion that it is improper for the state to create rich and poor educational spending authorities. No one argued that any particular level of spending was required or that special needs had to be met with extra money. Indeed, it was repeatedly emphasized to the Court that differences from district to district in spending levels were not at stake. It would be quite proper, for example, to create school districts with equal capacity to raise money (there are many ways to achieve this) and to permit each district to select its own level of expenditure based upon its voters' willingness to bear taxes for schools. Such systems are generally called "power-equalizing"; they reward the school district for its rate of tax effort, not for its concentration of oil wells or high value residences.

What *Rodriguez* represented, in effect, was a judicial opportunity to give legislatures the political capacity to achieve true local control. The Texas system there at stake had effectively reserved budget control to the rich districts by mandating a curriculum that the poor could barely afford. If Texas were interested in local control for more than a few, it could arrange it easily by power equalizing the present school districts as Kansas

now has done. Powell seems to have misunderstood this point; he paints the defendants and himself as the friends of local control. This is, of course, historically an appealing stance for American politicans. It merely happens to be false.

What is the overall significance of *Rodriguez* to my theme? Merely this; that the majority of the Supreme Court has now legitimated the historic triune pattern of public education—that is: (1) choice and excellence for the rich who can elect either to reside in a rich district, or to buy a private education; (2) excellence but no choice for the family of average wealth or less living in property-rich districts; (3) educational deprivation without choice for the average family in property-poor districts.

Given this present posture, what help or further hurt can the education of the common man expect from the legal system in the remainder of this century? From unaided state and federal politics I would predict more of the same—which is, in effect, nothing. Educational politics cannot reform itself. A primary effect of such legislative stasis will be the further degeneration of faith in public education. Imagine, if you will, how Demetrio Rodriguez and his neighbors view their schools and the society which visits such intellectual obscenity upon their children. On a larger scale, I would predict an accelerated enfeeblement of local government in general. A society which first creates, then tolerates, then enshrines in organic law such a have and have not system of local authorities cannot be serious about local control. What it is clearly serious about is the artificial preservation of haphazard privilege. Whoever now has shall continue to have—period. Such is not a policy of local control. Indeed, it is hard to find the appropriate label for this policy—or non-policy.

It is not, however, difficult to predict the ultimate fate of the current abomination. Lacking any rationale, corrupting its own beneficiaries, and generating enormous resentment from its victims, the system someday will go down. The pity is that, in the process, there may perish one of the last opportunities for cultural and governmental pluralism. What is likely to emerge—what most academic reformers, in fact, seem to prefer—is a statewide, even a national, fiscal system of support for and control of education. And, of course, there is no intellectual bulwark against the cultural homogeneity implied in this except a strong system of local control that is defensible in terms of distributive justice. Mr. Justice Powell has made such an outcome very difficult to achieve; he is the kind of friend local government might well be spared.

With all of this bad news, there must be a pony someplace, and I am pleased to discover him to you. While the Nixon five were patching leaks

in the status quo, a breach or two has elsewhere appeared. As you know, on April 3, 1973, the New Jersey Supreme Court upstaged their federal brethren with a unanimous decision declaring invalid the state scheme for financing public education. This was accomplished through an interpretation of the state constitution, an outcome insulated from further review. The same result is expected in California where it all began. There, *Serrano v. Priest* will be back in the state supreme court for final review under the state constitution. It seems likely to be reaffirmed. There is a fair chance that in Michigan, and perhaps in Washington and Arizona, state supreme courts will reach similar conclusions. What a striking example of the protean sources of legal influence upon education. Who would have chosen state judges as potential heroes?

Suppose that the California, New Jersey, and Michigan courts all manage to open up the legislative dialogue in their respective states—comprising one-fifth of the nation's population. What further "legal" consequences can be predicted for education? Much depends, I believe, upon the strength in each state of the political forces divided over the issue of centralized and decentralized control of finance. Each legislature must first decide whether the interests of children imply a statewide expenditure norm; they could decide, as in Kansas, that the same interest is better served by assuring merely a statewide spending minimum (plus state money for special needs), while permitting districts to add "power-equalized" increments of spending. For example, all districts might be permitted to spend an extra $25 per child for each additional mill imposed on local property by local voters. Where voters approved such added levies, this would of course involve subsidies to poorer districts and, possibly, recapture from rich districts. The effect would be that, for districts receiving similar amounts from the statewide program, the amount of added spending would depend solely upon tax rate, not district property wealth.

But where, then, has this taken us? Under power equalizing, district wealth would no longer affect spending, but—in either centralized or decentralized systems—poor and average-wealth families would yet remain effectively without choice. Such a legal mechanism imposes upon them either a statewide or local norm, politically selected, and compels their children to accept it. The system would now be fair, but would yet remain unfree. We will have gained a bit of ground in terms of distributive justice, but little in terms of human autonomy or educational variety.

If such latter values were thought attractive, their enjoyment can be assisted by law. Since Thomas Paine and Adam Smith, reformers and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conservatives alike have urged government to put its faith more in human persons than legislated institutions by subsidizing the family instead of the school. There are, of course, many varieties of "vouchers." My colleagues and I contributed our own exotic version to this debate as early as 1969. Here I would only note the compatibility of family educational grants with the *Serrano* principle. Properly regulated, voucher systems would make it possible in theory to make any school, public or private, accessible to any family on equal terms regardless of that family's income or race, and—within reason—regardless of its location.[1]

Those who wish to promote experimentation with choice and variety for the poor presumably will surface in the forthcoming legislative debates in states like New Jersey. If this in fact happens, the political process will come to focus upon what is to me the most fundamental and challenging issue in all of education. That is, by what rationale should society apportion control over early education among parents, the state, and the child himself? The present dispensation has finessed the problem by permitting the elite to shape privately their own children's education while controlling and monopolizing the education of the common man in public institutions. I doubt that this economic dualism will remain unchallenged once courts begin to open up the legislative process. It would be surprising if the black parents of Newark, given the option, would settle merely for better funded public schools. Here the example of the Amish is fresh. They escaped altogether from formal education because the law respected their ideological uniqueness. It is at least arguable that those who wish rather to remain in school will find analogous support in the Constitution—or at least in a newly opened legislative process—for the expression of their differences.

These considerations bring us quite naturally and finally to the bedrock question—"whose differences"? Dissenting in the Amish case, Justice Douglas pointed out that it was the parents whose decisions had been crucial in withdrawing the children from school. Is it the parents' right or the child's which is at stake? If it is the child's, who shall speak for him before he can speak for himself? And for such purposes, when shall his personal autonomy be respected by law? These are issues which can be expected to engage the attention of lawyers in the next generation. For better or worse, the law and the schools are likely to ride the same unruly steed on the path ahead.

---

[1] For full specification of such a model, see Coons and Sugarman, *Family Choice in Education* (Institute of Government Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1971).

FINANCING PUBLIC EDUCATION

Charles S. Benson

Concerning matters of finance, what are the salient characteristics of the American system of public education? To answer such a question, we must decide first of all whether we are thinking of elementary-secondary or of higher education, for though both components exist in the public sector (not exclusively but in major degree), they have characteristics which are substantially different. Because of the recent flurry of activity in re-examining the financial arrangements used to support our public schools, I suggest we begin with the elementary-secondary component.

Financial Characteristics of Public Schools

The following characteristics seem to be important.

1. Typically, the number of school districts in a given state is large.[1] Consider our two biggest states (in terms of population): New York and California New York has 760 school districts (1970) and California has 1,185. Only 21 of New York's districts enroll as many as 12,500 students (roughly 1,000 per grade); in California only 86 serve as many as 12,500 students.

2. School districts, as units of local government, carry both administrative and financial responsibilities. On the one hand, they have power to hire and fire professional staff, design physical plant, and determine curricula in accordance with statutes and regulations of state government. On the other hand, they are charged to balance their budgets by exercise of power to levy a tax on physical properties that fall within their boundaries. In 1971, school districts, on the average, provided from their local tax sources 55.3 percent of funds spent in public elementary and secondary schools.

3. Taxable capacity varies substantially within regions. On Long Island, Manhasset has $87,000 in taxable values per student while Levittown has $16,000 (1968-69 figures). In California's Bay Area, Richmond's per student taxable capacity is only $12,320, while that of the nearby

John Swett District is $28,270 (1969-70). The variation reflects differences in values of residences (which differences themselves are closely related to household income); they also reflect an exceedingly uneven geographic distribution of commercial and industrial properties.

4. The uneven spread of taxable values tends to create a situation in which property-poor districts levy local taxes at relatively high rates to receive, in exchange, low-priced school services, while property-rich districts are able to finance handsome programs at low rates. Manhasset's full value tax rate was $1.61 per $100 of assessment and its school program cost $1,759 per student; Levittown's tax rate at $2.72 was 69 percent higher than Manhasset's and its expenditures, at $1,189, were 32 percent lower. Likewise in the Bay Area, Richmond has a tax rate of $5.12 (on 25 percent assessment) to support a program of $975 per student; John Swett, the financially more fortunate community, has a tax rate of $3.41 and a school expenditure level of $1,180. Both pairs of districts, Manhasset and Levittown in New York and Richmond and John Swett in California, compete for teachers' services within their bounded regional markets; hence, the fact that Levittown's expenditures per student are high, say, as compared with some communities in upstate New York or that Richmond's salary scale looks good relative to those of rural towns out in the agricultural valleys of California, is not especially relevant in determining effective buying power in the market for educational resources.

If the System is Bad, Why Has It Lasted So Long?

Education is compulsory through all of the elementary and most of the secondary years. For cost reasons, private secular schooling of acceptable standards is available only to a very small percentage of the population. With regard to rights of school enrollment, district boundaries are virtually inviolate. Hence we must conclude that state governments intend to force large numbers of our population to make use of schools that are demonstrably inferior to schools enjoyed by other members of our society.

If differences in standards are small, we might argue on *de minimus* grounds that no social problem exists. I suggest that the differences are wide. Some years ago, I wrote a book (*The Cheerful Prospect*, 1965) in which I drew a contrast between the filth and violence in certain central city schools and the landscaped elegance of educational operations in rich suburbs. Title I grants notwithstanding, I believe my statements of eight

years ago are still mainly true.

However, we do not have to rely upon a big city/suburban dichotomy to make the point. Just looking at the suburbs will do. Amongst neighboring districts on Long Island, annual expenditures vary by as much as $20,000 a classroom. It is beyond imagining that school authorities in rich districts are so foolish and that their colleagues in poor districts are so wise that the $20,000 expenditure gap doesn't present an important qualitative distinction.

Ellwood Cubberly drew attention to this kind of apparent inequity in 1906. His example was Connecticut. The California Supreme Court repeated his arguments (with new figures, of course) in 1971, pointing out that within the confines of a single county—Los Angeles—districts such as Baldwin Park, given their poverty of taxable resources, could not conceivably levy taxes at such rates as would be required to buy high-priced educational services, while at the same time rich districts stood in the position of advantage mentioned above. Now, if the financial system that supports our largest public activity, excepting only defense, has survived 65 years after its apparent inequity was brought to light, then we can profitably look (a) for redeeming virtues in that system and (b) for political alignments that serve to protect the system from structural revision.

With the possible exception of the late Henry Morrison of the University of Chicago, most professors of educational administration have held rather consistently to the view that the system possesses redeeming features:

1. The system is seen to be productive of revenue. Let me illustrate this point in the following fashion. In March of this year, the (State) Superintendent's Advisory Committee on School Finance in Illinois submitted its Final Report. The majority of the Committee voted for "full state funding," that is, for take-over of education finance by the state government. The chairman of the Committee and a long-time analyst of governmental arrangements in education, G. Alan Hickrod, issued a dissent from the majority recommendation in the following terms: "At the present time in Illinois, and in most other states, educators tolerate a certain amount of inequity in school expenditures as the price they pay for engaging in a game of 'catch-up.' The rules are widely known but seldom frankly discussed. Essentially, the game proceeds by having the wealthier districts move their expenditure levels upward, and the education community places pressure on state governments to assist the poorer local districts to catch up, within a reasonable distance, of the

leaders. . . I for one am not at this point prepared to give up this game though I do wish to change the rules to favor the poorer districts. Full state funding will end forever our little game of 'catch-up' and place the decisions regarding how well, or how poorly, K-12 education will be funded entirely at the state level. . . I submit it is quite possible that having given up our local leverage factor we could find support for K-12 education languishing as the General Assembly is faced with many demands for state money other than for public education."[2]

2. The system maintains the allegiance of rich households. The suburban rich have little reason to choose to send their children to private schools, for they have exclusive rights to high quality public institutions supported by their local taxables. Our suburban schools can best be viewed as a quasi-public system, but let us admit that greed in the public sector has its uses. Because the rich use schools that are called public, we have managed to avoid a "two-class" arrangement, let us say, under which the affluent shun tax-supported institutions and all the rest of us feel we have no alternatives but to use them. If the rich made little use of institutions called public, I fear status distinctions in American education would become substantially greater than they are now.

   The other reason for finding it good that rich households use public schools is actually an extension of the argument made just above to the effect that the existing system of finance is highly productive of revenue. Rich persons have, it would seem, expansive ideas about the amounts of money that should properly be spent on schools. At the same time, we may imagine that they exert more influence in both state and local councils of government than their simple numbers would warrant. By the fact that they themselves, say, are graduates of public schools and that their children attend (or have attended) such institutions, they probably are more inclined to urge generosity toward public education than if they had never had firsthand contact with the system and saw it strictly in the light of a merit good.

3. The system, so it is said, preserves values of localism in government. In my view, and even though it bulks large in the arguments of Justice Powell in *Rodriguez*, this argument should be viewed with skepticism, insofar as it stands separately from arguments previously presented. It is true that some small communities maintain a sense of neighborliness in the management of school affairs–and of local affairs generally. But some communities, so it would appear, use their powers of local control

to exclude the poor and black and brown from their districts. Indeed, the most distressing feature of our systems of local government finance, in my opinion, is the monetary incentive provided to perpetuate residential exclusions by race and class. Furthermore, the advantages of local control, whatever they may be, are most unevenly distributed. Residents of large cities do not seem to feel they are consulted as to their wishes; likewise, school boards in large cities do not have an especially good record in conducting negotiations with organized teachers.

What residents of big cities might prefer is to have more to say about the day-to-day operations of the school or schools they are most immediately involved with—whether as parent, teacher, paraprofessional, administrator, or whatever. Parents might welcome a greater degree of choice about the types of educational services their children consume, and so might young people themselves. These latter changes do not depend upon whether the city school board has power to balance its budget from local taxables.

Advocates of local control hold that it breeds innovation. On this point we could ask ourselves how many important innovations we have witnessed in education and how much local control is responsible for the flow, apart from the effects of high-level revenue generation. Does local control, in other words, enhance the productivity of the educational system or does it simply whet the appetite for even-more-expensive programs?

So we see that the ultimate argument for local control has already been given—revenue generation. We cannot play "catch-up" and we cannot maintain the interest of the rich in supporting tax increases for schools unless the rich and the middle class in general are able to isolate themselves, their children, and their local taxables in suburban districts far away from the claims of the less fortunate—this is the contention.

As for the second part of the question raised in this section, why the system of education finance is so resistant to change through the political process, I defer to the judgment of experts in government. However, I may be allowed a few observations. When education finance legislation is debated in state legislatures, one of the chief groups to become involved politically is organized teachers. Teachers groups face proposals for reform of education finance with a divided mind. On the one hand, they recognize that the present system is inequitable and frequently they are willing to make public statements to this effect. On the other hand, they see that

reform may cost them the means to play one district off against another in bargaining for salaries, fringes, and workload. They are fully aware, that is, of the revenue-generating power of the present system. Further, teachers in high-salary districts would surely suffer losses relative to teachers in low-salary places, and this makes it hard for statewide organizations of teachers to speak for reform in a loud, clear, and united voice.

A group that *can* speak in a loud, clear voice *against* reform is owners of property in property-rich districts. Whether in the role of householders, industrialists, or owners of shopping centers, property holders in rich low-tax districts probably stand to suffer capital losses through education finance reform, for those low tax rates are likely to have been capitalized into the values of the properties they own. In my opinion, this group holds substantial political power.

On the other side, one might expect to see coalitions of the poor exerting pressure on legislators to reform education finance. In my experience, I have not found much pressure of this kind to exist. One reason may be that the poor are badly organized. But another explanation is in order: Most of the reform plans so far brought to light—those, that is, that deal with issues of education finance on a statewide basis—offer few gains to the poor; indeed, some of the poor would actually suffer under their implementation. The primary beneficiaries of the new conventional wisdom in education finance, if I may use such a phrase, are the lower middle class, the policemen, the firemen, the operatives and clerks who live in the Levittowns of this country. This constituency does not feel comfortable, I would hold, with the present leadership of the reform movement: poverty lawyers, adventuresome state officers, and socialist-minded academics. Yet, I would not be surprised to see a Levittown-type group obtain counsel, and not *pro bono publico* counsel either, of high-prestige firms, in order to explore their rights through the courts.

Enter the Courts: New Possibilities and New Uncertainties

In its unusual ruling on demurrer in *Serrano v. Priest*, the California Supreme Court held (August 31, 1971) that, should the facts of the case be confirmed in retrial, the state's system of education finance violated equal protection guarantees to be found in the Federal Constitution and in the State's Constitution. The Court based its argument on the following grounds: Education, at least lower education, represents a fundamental interest in the same sense that the right to vote does; accordingly, the

provision of educational services properly is the subject of strict scrutiny; under process of strict scrutiny, provision of education is seen to be subject to a suspect classification, namely, taxable wealth of school districts; such distribution of educational opportunities, repugnant on its face, finds no defense in any compelling interest of the state.

The logic of the case was clear, at first glance anyway, and *Serrano*-type cases spread like wildfire across the land. The credo was stated as follows: "Quality of education shall not be a function of wealth, except the wealth of the state as a whole."[3] One case, the *Rodriguez v. San Antonio Independent School District* case of Texas, quickly found its way to the U.S. Supreme Court, District Court having found for plaintiffs. On March 22, 1973, the Court announced its reversal of appellee's argument by a 5-4 vote. The majority opinion of Justice Powell swept away the possibility of a concerted, speedy, nationwide attack on the problem of inequity in education finance.

Necessarily, the U.S. Supreme Court based its argument on the U.S. Constitution. Justice Powell did not make serious attack on the doctrine of fundamental interest; rather, he stated that, "Education. . . is not among the rights afforded explicit protection under our Federal Constitution." State constitutions in more instances than not appear to describe education as a fundamental right, and thus state courts are free to require strict scrutiny of education finance arrangements, if arguments presented to them so warrant. The spotlight, interestingly enough, shifts back to California and to Judge Bernard Jefferson in Los Angeles County Superior Court, where the *Serrano* case is now (May 1973) in the last stages of retrial. His findings, expected this summer, will be of major importance in determining whether judicial pressure for reform will be applied to state legislatures by *state courts*.

If the issue of whether constitutional protection of peoples' rights demands strict scrutiny of education finance arrangements is at present unclear, we must recognize that Justice Powell raised another prickly issue as well: absolute vs. relative deprivation. He stated (and in so doing drew a distinction between *Rodriguez* and earlier equal-protection cases having to do with voting and right of accused to counsel): "The argument here is not that children in districts having relatively low assessable property values are receiving no public education; rather, it is that they are receiving a poorer quality education than that available to children in districts having more assessable wealth. . . a sufficient answer to appellees' argument is that at least where wealth is involved the Equal Protection Clause does not require absolute equality of precisely equal advantage. Nor, indeed, in view

of the infinite variables affecting the educational process, can any system assure equal quality of education except in the most relative sense." Public-interest lawyers and educators alike are finding much to think on in that argument. Where, for example, does relative deprivation become absolute?

Returning to an issue we discussed earlier, we need also consider whether toleration of relative disparities is essential to a high level of revenue generation for schools. *If it is*, then we should go further and ask whether the poor are benefited by relative disparities. Assuming for the moment that poor people live in property-poor districts (not always the case), are they helped by a "trickle down" process of resource allocations? Let me put it this way: For a poor household, is it better to live in a state where disparities in provision are small and the general level of support is low—or to live in a state where disparities are wide but the minimum standard of provision is relatively high? The issue is posed, of course, only if the answer to the first question of this paragraph is affirmative.

Major Reform Proposals

In the wake of the first *Serrano* decision, two main kinds of reform proposals have been displayed: full state funding and district power equalizing.

1. *Full State Funding.* The basic premise is that the state government becomes the one and only source of public school revenue. In making a concrete proposal of this type, one of the first problems to be faced is what to do about existing disparities in spending, one district to the next. The general approach is to force expenditures in low-spending districts gradually upward while holding high-spending authorities at constant expenditures per student (in current or real dollars, as the choice may be). The levelling up process may be applied on a statewide or regional basis.

   Full state funding proposals are generally accompanied by recommendations to the state government that it make greater use of categorical grants to districts in order better to recognize different types of educational needs or different types of students. They also generally rely upon statewide taxation of property for schools at a uniform statewide rate and they may include proposals for income-specific property tax relief—the "circuit breaker."

2. *District Power Equalizing.* This plan makes use of similar complementary features: increased use of categorical grants, statewide property taxation, property tax relief for poor households, and so on. DPE differs from full state funding, however, in the distribution of noncategorical, that is, general-purpose, grants by the state government. Under DPE, the amount of money received by a school district depends in part on its rate of spending from local sources. It is a kind of matching grant, in other words. But the state adjusts the grant so that "earnings" of state funds by property-rich districts is less than by property-poor for any given amount of local effort (per student). Indeed, DPE provides that local tax rates will be precisely the same in all districts that spend the same sum of dollars per student. Under DPE, very rich districts will no longer be able to keep all the money they raise locally for schools; rather, they must hand over some of the yield of their great wealth to the state for redistribution to poorer places.

As between these two main reform plans, what are the arguments? DPE preserves the right and duty of local districts to play "catch-up," though it tilts the rules of the game strongly to the disadvantage of property-rich districts. Some of the local dynamics claimed for the present finance system would be lost, but not all. In this sense, DPE points a path toward major reform while preserving the general direction of development of American education.

Arguments for full state funding were effectively summed up in the Fleischmann Commission (New York):

> We prefer full State funding to district power equalizing for several reasons. First, assume that wealthy districts are inhabited by wealthy residents and poor districts are populated by the poor. All district power equalizing does then is to assure equity in tax rates vis-a-vis school expenditures. Poor people would have difficulty in meeting the competition of rich people in rich districts, once the latter saw how the finance plan was shaping up and raised their school tax rates to preserve their favored position.
>
> Second, assume (as we do) that there is no absolute standard of education which can be described as 'adequate'—that all educational disparities are relative. Then, if one is going to embark on a major revision of educational finance arrangements, why should one not remove 'place' inequalities as well as wealth inequalities? The quality of a child's education should, in our view, be no more a function of

how highly his neighbors value education than of how wealthy they are. . .

To make the point clear, consider two districts, A and B, and let them be of equal wealth. Suppose the residents of district A choose a school problem half as costly as that chosen by the residents of district B. Is it good policy for the State to require the children of A to suffer the lifetime handicap of inferior education, which is to say, should the State exclude these children from the benefits of district B education on the basis of a district boundary line that itself is a historical accident? As we understand the ideals of a democracy, public institutions—and especially the schools—should see to it that personal attributes such as aptitude, talent, and energy play a progressively larger role in an individual's success and development, while parental wealth, on the one hand, and apathy, on the other, play a progressively smaller role. We see no way for this ideal to be achieved in the absence of direct State intervention in the allocation of educational resources.

One of the functions of an educational system is to act as a sorting device. Classification of people on grounds of ability and aptitude occurs all the time, and schools often act as a major transmitter of the process. But if primary schooling of some children is of vastly greater quality than that of other children, the sorting process is ineffective and dangerous. Local tastes for basic educational services should not distort the function of the sorting mechanism and possibly undermine students' potential and achievements.[4]

Neither plan, however, implies equal expenditures on all students in all districts. Categorical grants from state government are intended to assure the contrary. To paraphrase Fleischmann, educational distributions should reflect educational criteria, of which there are two chief ones: (a) educational requirements of different types of students and (b) geographic differences in the prices of educational services of given quality. As Will Riggan recently stated,

We have been so caught up, entangled, in this tub-thumping phrase or in reaction against its operational weaknesses that to *promote inequality* is, at first blush, heresy. But it is heresy at first blush only, for what I am suggesting is that our constitutents and our personal sanity may both be better served by approaching the problems of improving lower education in our respective states by

careful consideration of which inequalities we wish to promote and which abolish.

The nation's schools do not now treat all children equally, nor for some purposes should they. While there is a proper hue and cry over gross expenditure inequalities that are the result of unequal taxable wealth in various communities, there are at the same time few who begrudge spending more money on the education of a physically handicapped child than on a so-called normal student. In point of fact, our education systems are, in the ways they treat taxpayers and students, constantly creating or reproducing inequalities.

However, deciding today which inequalities are beneficial and which are pernicious and then acting accordingly goes far beyond equalizing tax burdens and expenditures within a state, though that kind of redress is virtually a prerequisite.[5]

Education Reform and the Poor

Earlier I stated that the proposals for statewide reform of education offer little benefit to the poor. Since public sector reforms are generally thought to be income redistributing, how can this be?

In the first instance, we must note that many poor people live in property-rich school districts. It is the poor who inhabit the grimy types of industrial tax havens. There they exchange the discomfort of living amidst heavy traffic, smoke, and noxious fumes for the benefits of a large local tax base. Frequently, they manage to buy expensive local services at low tax rates. Education reform would raise their tax rates and possibly put a lid on their expenditures. Many other poor people live in large cities. Both New York City and San Francisco must be described as rich school districts. The apparent wealth is explained in part by the fact that households in these two cities make much use of parochial schools, and this fact raises the values of their local taxables per public school student. And their wealth is only apparent, for their local tax rates for all public services are quite high. Yet, statewide education finance reform could damage the fiscal position of these two cities and, hence, could bring harm to the poor people who live within them. Reform plans, it is admitted, frequently include recommendations to state governments to supply massive categorical grants to low-income (or low-achieving) students; yet, even if such measures were voted by legislature (which is doubtful), they are subject to item veto by the Governor. They are features, that is, easily separable from

financial reform that "satisfies *Serrano*."

The second instance is a problem of greater scope. Let us admit that some poor people live in property-poor districts. In those cases, they would receive the same order of financial benefit as do the residents of Levittown. Why cannot these financial benefits be translated into improved educational services? I believe they can, but I also believe that the rate of improvement is functionally related to the present degree of fit between services rendered to households and services desired. The people of Levittown, I am told, think well of their schools. They would like to have lower tax rates and they would like to have more school services. Education finance reform can help them on both counts, and probably rather quickly.

The typical school attended by very poor people is likely to have high rates of truancy, classroom disruption, and educational failure. Some teachers in such schools are openly hostile to and disrespectful of their students. Here, the gap between services rendered to households and services desired is wide. I do not think lower tax rates or greater school expenditures, though nice in (mini) income redistribution terms, will improve conditions very much in the short run.

So we meet a schism in thinking. I would characterize the *Serrano* approach to school reform as based upon the logic of political science. Improve the fiscal base of a poor school district and the local authorities will rearrange services better to meet the needs of local residents. Allocation of resources in the public sector is determined even in the short run by shifts in the budgets of individual local authorities; it is a process internal to local government. This thinking is basic to the emphasis that Justice Powell gives to preservation of "local control."

Insofar as the process of resource allocation in local government has an economic rationale, on the other hand, it is found in the propositions of Charles M. Tiebout.[6] Briefly put, the Tiebout argument runs as follows: Existence of large numbers of units of local government within metropolitan areas allows households to "vote with their feet" and to choose residence in that city, town, or village which gives them the combinations of public services they most strongly desire. Accordingly, households are able to find a point of equilibrium in which the least dollars spent on different local public services yield equal marginal utility. If local governments, moreover, are viewed as profit-maximizing institutions, then marginal utility in the local public sector will move towards equality with marginal utility of private sector goods. Such public-private equilibrium is, however, a long-run equilibrium.

The Tiebout "hypothesis," as it is commonly called, thus stands in sharp contrast to the political view of local government espoused in *Serrano* thinking. As I have said, under the political view, it is assumed that local governments respond *in the short run* to changes in household tastes of residents already in place. Under Tiebout's view (and it is probably the more realistic view on this count), local governments are unable to make any kind of important changes in the services they provide in the short run; hence, resource allocations are determined as households respond through choice of residence to the current offerings of the various governments in their metropolitan area. It is essentially the same process by which households, in theory, regulate resource distributions in the private sector, that is, by choosing to buy or not to buy goods and services offered by a particular supplier.

Policy conclusions—or "remedies" for judicial findings of improper state-local government structures—may be quite different depending on whether one accepts the economic point of view (as modified, possibly, from the original Tiebout position) or the political.

In the case of most households, most of the important kinds of public consumption at issue are forms of group consumption. In Tiebout terms, households seek to find residential locations that bring them into membership with the most congenial sets of groups possible (congeniality being defined as similarity of taste with respect to sets of local services). It is no refutation of the Tiebout arguments, on the other hand, to find that the very rich have more choices than the poor, for the very rich ultimately can substitute private consumption for group consumption.

A more difficult question will arise if we find that, while opportunities for satisfying diverse tastes in terms of group consumption exist, the range and quality of such opportunities seem to be related rather strictly to income class. Where one lives is strongly affected by the geographic distribution of land values and transport costs, both measured relative to one's income. While such a finding presumably would not cast serious doubt on the Tiebout "hypothesis" as a statement in economic theory, it would likely be taken to mean that the processes of short-term resource distributions in the local public sector operate notably better for some income groups than others. The policy implication is rather startling: Where "voting with one's feet" is working well, encourage decentralization and diversity in local government; where it is not working, devise means to allow households *and their individual members* to "vote" at their given place of residence (vouchers, intracity decentralizations, neighborhood control, provision of optional educational services by regional authorities,

programs to encourage suburban districts to accept students from outside their own districts, and yet more imaginative schemes to be devised). The important consideration would be to assure that groups of households were properly separated, for otherwise external diseconomies could become a problem—for example, if suburban residents as well as residents of low-income areas of large cities were entitled to vouchers, the former might use them to buy their way out of whatever degree of school integration had previously been laid upon them.

Empirical investigation of this line of argument is now underway at Berkeley. We hope our empirical study will offer guidance toward the formulation of a more diversified, sophisticated set of social policies than we have yet seen in the aftermath of *Serrano*. Trying to force all households into a single policy by functional fields, for example full state funding of education, may be a hare we cannot catch anytime soon, and we should be prepared in lieu to argue for a more complex set of alternatives than District Power Equalizing for statewide implementation.

A Note on Finance of Higher Education

In what is left of a paper of this length, one cannot deal with issues of finance of higher education in any thorough way, for they are vastly complex. I would like, however, to make a few observations.

The separation ordinarily afforded to treatment of issues of finance of higher and lower education has no basis in logic. Resource allocations in both segments should be improved if financial questions were dealt with in a more integrated fashion.

Under conventional wisdom, private benefits increase and social benefits decline the longer the educational career of an individual is extended. From this argument we have concluded that the individual and his family should pay a large share of the costs of higher education, with costs seen as including foregone income (or, alternatively, living expenses of students).

However, a new kind of equity criterion is coming to dominate the discussion of finance of higher education. Rather than attempting to perfect the distribution of social benefits and costs of higher education, the analyst is seeking policies that maximize access to institutions. For example, the Report of the Task Force on Financing Higher Education (Francis Keppel, Chairman) has recommended that students from low-income families receive *grants* to meet all fees in public institutions *and* to

meet a substantial part of their living costs. The program would be financed from federal and state sources. To relieve the burden on New York State taxpayers, the Task Force recommends that middle and high income households be required to pay tuition fees in all public institutions, including City University of New York.

Yet, let us recognize that education, after a point, necessarily serves to widen and reinforce differences in natural endowments. This fact may suggest a policy to offer cash grants to the noneducationally-minded young. As Harry G. Johnson has stated, "If. . . inequality is considered a problem, one should recognize that the poorest among us, and the one most deserving of help from his fellowmen, is the one whom nature forgot to endow with brains—and that the way to make it up to him is not to exclude him from school and tax him to pay part of the cost of educating his intellectually well-endowed and no-longer-poor peer group among the children of poor parents, but to give him money in lieu of the brains he lacks."[7]

The final equity criterion of an educational system, in my opinion, is not to be found exclusively in financial distributions, though these are important. As I see it, the final criterion is to be found in the uses made of education—who does what for whom and under what conditions. Equity would be improved if we established a requirement of a year of national service as a condition for receiving the baccalaureate degree. But service need not be confined to one short period of an educated person's life, and the question of whether our skills are used to exploit or serve remains with us over our whole lifetime.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

[1]The statement does not apply to all states. Southern states favor counties as school districts, so they have relatively few. Hawaii operates the school system of the state as a single district.

[2]*Final Report of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on School Finances*, G. Alan Hickrod, Chairman, Springfield, Illinois, April 1973, p. 105.

[3]Sometimes known as "Proposition I," the idea is developed in John E. Coons, William H. Clune III, and Stephen D. Sugarman, *Private Wealth and Public Education*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

[4]*The Fleischman Report on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education in New York State*, New York, (Viking Press, 1973, pp. 89-90).

[5]Will Riggan, "School Finance Research in the Seventies," A Paper Prepared for Conference of the National Education Finance Project, Atlanta, April 3, 1973, pp. 3-4.

[6]Charles M. Tiebout Jr., "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditure," *Journal of Political Economy*, October 1956.

[7]Harry G. Johnson, "The Alternatives Before Us," *Journal of Political Economy*, May-June 1972, p. S289.

COMMUNITY INFLUENCES ON EDUCATION

Michael W. Kirst

The issues of citizen participation and community influence in education have become more visible and insistent in the past decade. The movements for community control, decentralization, and parent participation have been significant currents running through American education. But these currents run upstream against powerful countercurrents that have limited the role and influence of lay people in making American school policy. Indeed, many observers contend that the school board is a weak institution that is failing to represent and implement adequately the views of the lay community.[1] These observers contend school policy is dominated by professional administrators and organized teachers with lay people becoming increasingly vocal but having little impact. Interest-group activity is dominated by the PTA and other status quo groups.

This pessimistic appraisal is disputed by those who agree that American public schools were a closed system of policy making but in recent years school policy making is being opened to broader and more effective community influence. The optimists predict the trend is toward greater lay participation. We have gone through the most ineffective era in terms of community influence. This paper will discuss historical roots of community influence, assess the current situation, and make some suggestions for improvements. As requested by Educational Testing Service, I will proceed from the perspective favoring greater lay influence in school policy making. By community influence I will mean all types of *lay involvement* in school policy making–from parent involvement to community-based interest groups and school boards.

A Historical Viewpoint

The basic administrative structure and pattern for current school policy making was established around the turn of the twentieth century. This era reinforced the norm of separation of education from community politics, even though political action is a prime way community influence can be effective. This era had several key impacts on the key formal structure for community influence–the lay school board. Around 1900, a nationwide

group of opinion leaders emerged including university presidents, school superintendents, and lay allies from the urban business and professional elites. One of their prime aims was to emancipate the schools from what these people contended was excessive decentralization and partisan politics. Indeed, many politicians at that time regarded the schools as a useful support for the spoils system and awarded teaching jobs and contracts for supplies as political favors.[2] A decentralized, ward-based committee system for administering the public schools provided good linkages to community opinion but also was an administrative nightmare with tinges of corruption. For example, Philadelphia in 1905 had 43 elected school district boards consisting of 559 members.[3] While there were great variations, at the turn of the century 16 of 28 cities of more than 100,000 population had boards of 20 members or more.

The reformers contended that boards elected by wards injected pernicious policies and special interests at the expense of the needs of the entire school district. What was needed to offset this splintering of the public interest was board election at-large, smaller school boards, and different kinds of board members. A good school system is good for everyone, not just a part of the community. This viewpoint institutionalized what Salisbury has termed "the myth of the unitary community."[4] Since there are no legitimate "special" group interests in education, there is no reason to give particular groups or areas in the community a seat. To give a seat to labor or design a district for an ethnic minority would be wrong because it would constitute recognition of a special-group perspective on educational policy. As Salisbury stressed, "in a unitary community there is really no such thing as a representation on the school board, since there are no interests to represent."

The primary prerequisite for better management was thought to be centralization of power in a chief executive who had considerable delegated authority from a school board elected at-large. The watchwords of reform became centralization, expertise, professionalization, nonpolitical control, and efficiency. Civil service bureaucracies of certified professionals were granted the extensive powers once held by subcommittees of the school board. The preferred model was the large-scale industrial bureaucracies rapidly emerging in the turn-of-the-century economy. This model was fervently advocated by the National Education Association. Counts' classical study in 1927 demonstrated that it was the upper-class professionals and business people who replaced lower-middle-class representatives on the centralized boards of education.[5]

The "no politics" doctrine of community influence has displayed

impressive popularity and longevity among the general public. Professional educators have been quick to see the advantages in stressing expertise as a basis for policy making as opposed to openness to political viewpoints from various sections of the community. Although the term "politics" connotes nothing more sinister than resolution of conflict in community values over the means and ends of education, it has been branded as sordid and out of place. But the more we perpetuate the "no politics" doctrine, the more we mitigate the potential for community influence. The more we centralize power under professionals, the less opportunity we give to various subgroups in our community to have their views at least partially heeded in compromises over school policy. The more we contend interest groups have no place in school policy making, the more difficult we make it for particular community viewpoints to be transmitted to school authorities.

I would submit that education is fundamentally a political enterprise because of the inherent conflict in values surrounding its operation. One need only examine discussions of open classrooms, more time for basic skills, ethnic studies, alternative schools, discipline, community control, and length of student hair to find the conflicting viewpoints within any diverse community. The question becomes: Are the governance systems growing out of the turn-of-the-century reforms adequate to reflect these divergent and increasingly vocal community viewpoints?

The Governance Legacy of the Reformers

For several years now political analysts have contended that education is a relatively closed policy-making system when it is compared to Congress or local city government.[6] By closed they mean education is not open on a continuous basis to influence from its environment. Professional educators, and to a lesser extent school board members, have predominant influence and do not systematically seek lay community views. There is no two-party system to institutionalize opposition and generation of alternatives. The government of education is characterized by (1) periods of stability under the dominance of education officials with little influence from the community, and (2) shorter periods of abrupt change that often destroy professional careers when community concerns finally penetrate the education influence structure.[7] These short periods of public interest are characterized by turnover of boards and superintendents.

Although there are 17,000 local school districts that vary greatly,

recent research by Harmon Ziegler has offered empirical support for these assertions. Ziegler surveyed a national sample of school districts through both interviews and standardized questionnaires. He found the reformers' dream of an insulated educational system has been realized. With regard to school boards:

- only half the school board members accept the legitimacy of demands originating from community groups. The other half regard community pressure groups as outside the proper school influence system.
- there is a strong tendency for boards to perpetuate themselves. Only about half of the board members were elected in a contest with an incumbent.
- most board members can cite only one difference with their electorate opponents and the differences rarely relate directly to the educational program.[8]

Ziegler and Jennings sum up school board politics this way:

> . . . we can say that the recruitment process implies that the potential resources of boards–representative capacity and legal authority–are under-utilized. It is not surprising that school boards are WASPish; what does bear directly upon resource utilization is the low-keyed, self-perpetuating selection process which minimizes conflict. Such a selection process subverts the notions of lay control and hence the "public" orientation of board members. Orthodoxy and tradition are cherished; controversy is not. There is little intensive lay, or group, involvement in elections. Thus boards emerge as relatively impermeable. The early education reformers have succeeded too well: politics (i.e., partisan) and education are normally separate. Thus, the superintendent's basic resources–technical skills, information skills, information monopoly, expertise–are not matched by an equally resourceful board. As we continue to describe the decisional culture of school systems, the lack of a balance of power between board and superintendent will become apparent.[9]

For superintendents, expertise has become not only a resource but a way of life learned early and essential for occupational survival. Lacking staff, information, and linkages to the community, school boards find themselves reacting to the superintendent's agenda which highlights expertise and routine as much as possible. Two-thirds of the board

members and three-fourths of the superintendents do not think the board's role should be that of a representative of the public desires—they stress the trustee role. But a trustee needs information and concrete policy issues to resolve. A study of 2,300 issues considered by the board over seven years in Baltimore found that 2,000 of them concerned staff personnel and school building. Only a handful related to instructional affairs. Most issues were defined as routine or requiring high levels of professional expertise. Only 10 percent of the issues included participation by outside groups.[10]

What groups do school boards hear from? The results of several surveys show the most active voice is the PTA. Almost two-thirds of the board members in the Jennings and Ziegler study cited the PTA, followed in order by one-third of the members who mentioned contact with teacher groups. After that contact drops off rapidly: civil rights groups (29 percent), business groups (13 percent), right wing groups (13 percent), and labor organizations (3 percent). In short, in-house and supportive groups (PTA and teachers) have the most intense interaction with board members by a large margin.

Community group activity does escalate in an episodic fashion and is strongly associated with financial defeats, teacher firings, and superintendent turnover. No wonder it is feared by school officials. There is a strong incentive for education authorities to use their resources to buffer themselves against assault by "outside" groups. The at-large, nonpartisan election held in an off year with only a few board members running is designed to minimize the link between community demands and school policy. The PTA is a buffer or defense mechanism for administration that rarely gets beyond coffee, cookies, and hot dog day.

Gallup polls of what is on the lay public's mind indicate a high satisfaction with school boards and a lack of knowledge about substantive educational issues or what is happening at the schools. The major problems by very large margins are finance (23 percent) and discipline (22 percent). Curriculum is mentioned by only 5 percent, yet parents agree they learn little about education except through hard news in the media.[11] In short, an informed community might exert more influence, but there is little information and communication mechanism to bring this about. Gallup observed that this lack of information does not stem from a lack of public interest.

> When people are asked specifically what kind of information they would like to have, the answers deal to a large extent with the

> courses taught–the curriculum–innovations being introduced and why–college requirements–and the like. Significantly, there is great interest in the very areas that most school publicity presently neglects–the content of courses and the educational process versus school operations.[12]

No wonder school board elections have notoriously low voter turnouts.

It is this lack of information (and independent staff) which also handicaps the boards. Ziegler found only 4 percent of the boards "exercised independent agenda-setting authority." As one superintendent candidly put it:

> They don't know anything about (educational programs); but the things they do know they talk about, like sidewalks, sites, and so forth. I let them go on sometimes because I don't want them to talk about the curriculum.[13]

In the larger cities, the school boards and community groups (as well as the superintendent) have found themselves unable to implement their policies through a large bureaucracy of career professionals. It is one thing for a community group to succeed in lobbying for school board ratification, quite another for the community to trace implementation through a bureaucratic labyrinth. To what extent does the condition elsewhere approximate Rogers' summary of New York City before decentralization?

> Indeed, this is a system that is strangled in red tape; mired in inertia... insulated from its clients and from outside institutions; and fragmented into power blocs (teachers, principals, district superintendents, divisions, bureaus, staff units at headquarters and districts, a Board of Examiners) that veto new ideas and prevent the efficient use of resources by failure to coordinate. It is, in addition, leaderless; it has no adequate auditing, monitoring, or information system to evaluate programs and see if policies are carried out; it faces continued subversion of headquarters directives for change by field officials; it protects mediocrity through outdated civil service standards; it is highly inbred, allowing protectionist power blocs inside to develop and solidify their baronies and vested interests against client demands for change; it is then accountable to nobody but itself; and it victimizes almost anybody who comes in contact with it, including its superintendents and lay boards, who are emasculated with regularity by the professional staff, and whose efforts are absorbed by the cumbersome workings of the system.[14]

The most recent roadblock to community influence is organized teachers. Increasingly matters of educational substance as well as financial constraints are incorporated in collective bargaining contracts. The "community" is represented in these negotiations by the school board and in some cities by the mayor. Yet the influence of community pressure groups during the collective negotiations is usually minimal. Yet the agreement which may run several hundred pages forecloses many courses of action for future community interests.

Federal Aid and Community Influence

Federal categorical programs begun in the 1960s have been an important stimulus for community influence and participation. Several of the federal programs including Title I ESEA, Headstart, Follow-Through, and Community Action have required "parent involvement." This involvement has been defined in various ways including

1. parents as tutors of their own children,
2. parents as paid employees,
3. parents as advisors and decision makers.

It is the third category that concerns us here. Such programs encompass a wide and varied spectrum, from programs which seek to make school more "responsive" to parents (by informing them of decisions after making them) to schools which are actually controlled by the parents and community. These programs proceeded from the premise that changes in educational attainment of poor children could not be brought about solely through direct school services to individuals but were more likely to occur if the parents were empowered to help themselves. The Coleman report gave some empirical support by stressing the importance of home environment in pupil achievement.

With regard to parent decision-making roles and actual influence, SRI has published a typology which is useful in characterizing federally sponsored programs. The typology is useful for gauging the potential impact of community influence in local programs that are not tied to federal grants.[15]

1. *The Placation Role*—School officials and school boards allow community persons and parents to. . . make whatever minimum decisions necessary to keep the noise level down. According to SRI the placation

role has been the major response of school systems nationwide to federal mandates for community participation.

2. *The Sanctions Role*–The major purpose is to find highly visible persons who will sanction already established or newly developed school goals. School officials choose participants with widespread community recognition to spread approval for policies shaped by school authorities.

3. *The Information Role*–School officials bring together a group of persons who have information which school officials have decided they need or which they have been directed by someone (federal government, school board) to obtain. It is assumed lay participants have information about pupil needs, program features to be avoided, etc.

4. *Checks and Balances Role*–This role is to provide citizens with some inquiry, veto, and checkmate powers, which they might use to prevent being misled. The model necessitates a two-way exchange of information and citizens must approve or disapprove certain decisions regarding programs that have been gathered together to protect and to foster in their own image.

5. *The Change-Agent Role*–This role sets in motion a series of events that will assure change in the substance of education toward goals set by community organization. It subsumes the elements of the Information and Checks and Balances Role. Citizens have forward motion power as well as prevention power.

This typology provides citizens with some concepts for gauging the extent of involvement they should desire, or for analysing their current situation.

New Directions for Community Influence

Despite this bleak overall picture, the trend toward increased community influence is up. Basically, the demands of community groups, students, and ethnic minorities reflect some common themes.[16] They express unwillingness to continue a policy-making pattern dominated by professionals operating under professionally "neutral norms"–all taking place within a closed system. This dissatisfaction is manifested through public unwillingness to accept professional educators' views on tax and expenditure needs, on accountability for output performance, on student discipline, and to a lesser extent, on curriculum. The pressure in New York

City for community control and elimination of traditional civil service exams for jobs is a good case. The shifting of the financial base to state government gives community groups a new forum in which to press their demands. But public education is a "bottom heavy" enterprise of over 17,000 school districts and 2 million classroom teachers. It takes a long time for trends featured in the current newspaper headlines to permeate this massive enterprise—if they ever do.

From the perspective of enhancing community influence, what measures would be most effective? A reorientation of priorities from the turn-of-the-century reforms of centralization, depolitization, expertise, and civil service competence would be a first step. The new priorities would be increased representation, the school as the unit of governance, decentralization, and lay control. The value conflict inherent in education would be highlighted, not obscured behind a facade of professional expertise. The dismantling of the reforms could begin with:

- board elections by subcommunity districts rather than at-large
- all members of a school board running at once
- board elections held at the same time as major races for Governor and President
- optional use of partisan endorsements

School board effectiveness would be enhanced by its own independent staff. In large districts, decentralization and community control would accompany the above measures. Moreover, school board members would receive salaries in large districts and be expected to surrender part of their outside activities.

These central school board members would be buttressed by parent advisory councils (PAC) *for each school*. The PAC would have its prime responsibility in advising on the selection of the school principal. Principals would be given authority to make changes in several budget categories—for example, to trade aides for teachers and reprogram central allocations for equipment and supplies. "Principal power" would be matched by responsibility to a PAC at the school site level.

An annual report of school performance would be prepared *for each school*. This annual report would include such information as the characteristics of the community, school personnel, and students, a detailed breakdown of school expenditures including program and comparability accounts, the educational processes used, pupil and staff outcomes including both test and "softer outcomes." Such items as vandalism and library usage as well as affective indicators would be included.

The principal would also include in the annual school performance report a five-year plan indicating his views on priority educational goals and strengths and weaknesses of the existing program. He would also submit his plan for correcting any weaknesses. Some of the standard items would be skimmed off for the central school board, but most of the information would be disseminated only to the community. The performance reports would be mailed to each parent, and sent to community newspapers and to all community groups.

This type of governance plan recognizes that it is the school, rather than the entire district, which is the critical nexus between the child and the substance of education. The school center is also large enough to have relevance for state aid formulas. We need to know whether money for special federal and state programs is reaching the schools with the most needy pupils. Moreover, we need to know whether these needy schools are receiving an equitable share of the local district's budget for "regular" programs. Even in small school districts, it is the school site that is the biggest concern to the parents.

We need to rethink the reformer's assumption that the community is a unity for educational policy and that, consequently, there should be a uniform educational program in all schools. The above philosophy of the school site as the unit of organization can be linked to the concept of parent-choice clusters. Schools in the same geographical area could feature quite different programmatic approaches –open classrooms, self-contained, schools without walls, etc.– and parents could choose their preferred approach. All alternatives would be *within* the public sector to avoid the difficulties of an unregulated voucher scheme. Such a choice plan would provide greater leverage over school policy by parents who can vote with their children's feet. We found in school districts in Florida that the percentage of students in elementary schools who did poorly on tests ranged from 22 percent in one school to 78 percent in another. Clearly, this diversity in skill levels requires diversity in the practices, programs, and instructional methods of schools. An example of school-level organization of instruction with different content and objective is provided by Alum Rock, California (See Appendix).

Summing Up

My thesis is that the turn-of-the-century reforms in school organization and governance are now badly in need of reform to provide more effective

community influence. Structural change can only do so much. In part, we need ideological leadership that will stress the legitimacy of community interest group activity, a large change in the role and orientation of school board members, and a willingness to sacrifice some professional autonomy and expertise for increased democratic control. It is unlikely such leadership will come from the organized profession or from school board associations, which seem quite satisfied with the status quo. School boards are in real trouble, and I have recommended several specific steps for regenerating their representative and oversight functions.

In particular, I stress the school as the unit for instructional focus and community influence. The related parts of this school site program are:

1. an annual report of school performance.
2. the ability of the principal to have more autonomy from the central office in terms of budget, curriculum, personnel mixes, etc. At present principals seldom have, or use, the authority to make their school outstanding.
3. a parent advisory council at each school with one of its principal duties a recommendation on the retention of the principal. The PAC would also help provide criteria for selecting teachers and compile the school performance report.
4. parent-choice clusters that provide clearly defined programmatic options for parents to choose from within the public schools.[17]

I would urge community influence advocates not to be diverted by administrative decentralization which only transfers power from central professional administrators to field administrators. This is precisely the kind of marginal change likely to be most appealing in a period when school reform seems to have lost its zest. I would hope some of the above proposals could move us beyond the protracted debates on community control and that evanescent, ethereal concept called accountability.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

Name	*Program Name*	*Description*
Sylvia Cassell El.	Traditional	Basic skills development, emphasizing reading, writing, and arithmetic.
	Daily Living	Basic skills taught by doing.
K-6	Cultural Arts	Emphasizes study of different cultures. (Overall Kindergarten – to place in other programs.)
Mildred Goss	Open Activity Centered	Basic skills taught by doing.
	Developmental Reading	Based on reading – all other subjects relate to reading.
K-7	Seventh Grade	New 7th grade – based on community involvement.
McCollam	Traditional	Basic skills development, emphasizing reading, writing, and arithmetic.
	Individualized Learning	Learning is tailored to each student. Maximum parent involvement.
	Enrichment	A program for gifted children, grouped by ability, not age. Open to children who are creative and curious.
	Continuous Progress Non-graded	Emphasizes basic skills; students not grouped by grades; each learns at his own pace.
K-6		
Meyer	Basic Skills	Basic skills development, emphasizing reading, writing, and arithmetic.
	Sullivan Individualized Lang. Arts	Learning tailored to each student. BLR methods used.
	Fine Arts – Creative Expression	Concentrates on learning through the fine arts.
K-6	School 2000	Prepares students for the future.
Miller	Multi-cultural	Emphasizes study of different cultures. Spanish offered.
	Academic Skill Development	Basic skills development, emphasizing reading, writing, and arithmetic.
	Individualized	Learning tailored to each student.
K-6	Learning	

Continued on next page.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Community Influences

Name	*Program Name*	*Description*
Pala	Three "R"s Plus	Basic skills development, emphasizing reading, writing, and arithmetic.
	Creative Arts	Concentrates on learning through the creative arts.
	Fine Arts	Concentrates on learning through the fine arts.
	Math-Science	Concentrates on learning based on a mathematics-science core.
	Girls' Physical Education	Two periods a day of Physical Education for girls who want special sports emphasis.
6-8		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

[1]See for example Robert Bendiner, *The Politics of Schools* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969). For a more scholarly treatment see Harmon Ziegler and M. Kent Jennings, *Governing American Education* (Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press), forthcoming.

[2]See David B. Tyack, "Needed: The Reform of a Reform" in National School Boards Association, New Dimensions of School Board Leadership (Evanston, Ill.: NSBA, 1969), pp. 29-51.

[3]Tyack, *Ibid.*

[4]Robert Salisbury, "Schools and Politics in the Big City," in Michael Kirst (editor), *The Politics of Education at the Local, State and Federal Levels* (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1970).

[5]George S. Counts, *The Social Composition of Boards of Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, July 1927).

[6]See, for example, Laurence Iannaccone, *Politics in Education* (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1967).

[7]Laurence Iannaccone, *Politics in Education* (New York: Center for Applied Research on Education, 1967).

[8]See Jennings and Ziegler, *op. cit., passim.*

[9]*Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

[10]Eugene R. Smoley, *Community Participation in Urban School Government* (Washington, D.C.: USOE, Cooperative Research Project AS-029, 1965).

[11]*Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1972, pp. 33-46.

[12]George Gallup, *How the Nation Views the Public Schools* (Princeton: Gallup International, 1969), p. 9.

[13]Norman D. Kerr, "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation," *Sociology of Education*, 38 (Fall 1964), p. 51.

[14]David Rogers, "The Failure of Inner City Schools: A Crisis of Management and Service Delivery," in *Educational Technology* (September 1970), pp. 28-29.

[15]Marian Sterms and Susan Peterson, "Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education Programs: Definitions and Findings," SRI: Educational Policy Center, March 1973.

[16]This analysis is drawn in part from Frederick Wirt and Michael Kirst, *The Political Web of American Schools* (Boston: Little Brown, 1972).

[17]For an elaboration on this plan, see Walter I. Garms and Michael Kirst, *Improving Education in Florida* (Tallahassee: Office of the Governor, 1973), pp. 171-189. We would also allocate state aid for special programs directly to the school site rather than auditing solely at the district level.

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL GOALS

Seymour Martin Lipset

The presence of Governor Peterson reminds me of a story I told him earlier, which is appropriate both to education and his state of Delaware and which illustrates a point: that even the wisest of men or the most important of men can be wrong in his anticipations about the future, particularly with respect to the impact of education. In 1798, then President John Adams wrote a letter to his Secretary of State about the impending visit of a group of French scientists to the United States. He wrote saying that, as he looked around the world, it struck him that most of the social disturbances then racking the world—the period of the French revolution and assorted events stemming from it—could be credited to ideas and activities stemming from learned academies not under direct control of the governments. And, as a result of his belief that academicians, that universities and research institutions, cause trouble, he suggested that, if the Secretary could find an excuse for keeping this group of French scientists out of the country, he ought to do so.

The Secretary of State, fortunately, or unfortunately as you may feel, failed in this endeavor, with an enormous subsequent impact on the state of Delaware, not to speak of the rest of us. For one of these French scientists was named duPont—E.I. duPont de Nemours—and he achieved some fame in this country after he settled here.

If one examines what makes America unique, it is clear that one of the principal distinguishing aspects of the United States as a nation has been its emphasis on education. The census of 1840 reported that close to 90 percent of the white males were literate. This was probably an exaggerated figure—historians think that census was not that reliable—but it is striking that 90 percent of American men could be reported as literate at a time when in almost every other country in the world—with the possible exception of Scotland—the number who were literate in any sense of the term numbered only a small percentage. Latter-day, more statistically reliable comparisons with other nations of the American commitment to education, to literacy, to training people in schools have always found this country ahead of the others, as indicated by the percentage attending high school or going on to higher education. Estimates of the proportion of the given age cohort going to school at the higher levels of education have

always put the United States first. This lead is now being vitiated for the first time because we have reached near-saturation; over 80 percent graduate from high school, and half the cohort go on to some form of higher education.

One of the great historic achievements in the history of the United States, one of the statistical landmarks, occurred this year, one which is even more significant than the two previous high points noted in census sociological reporting. The Census Bureau had reported in 1890 that there was no longer any area that could be termed the frontier. The census of 1920 recorded for the first time in history that the majority of Americans lived in urban areas. In 1973 the United States census reported another first, that the proportion of college entry-age population entering colleges was exactly the same for blacks and whites. That is, as of 1973, the same percentage of blacks of college age enter American institutions of higher learning as do whites.

Now this, I think, is probably the most significant equality statistic that we have produced in this country. The implications of it can obviously be quite exaggerated. I do not want to make more of it than should be because clearly a much larger proportion of blacks than of whites entering colleges and universities attend the lower tiers of higher education. That is, more of them are in community colleges, more of them are in black colleges in the South. These are not among the better schools in the country; but, still the very fact that we have reached such equality of admission is, I think, one of the most important events in the history of the United States. So far the only major notice of it has been a small box the *New York Times* put on its front page. Since this statistic represents a product of more than a tripling of the proportion of blacks attending colleges and universities in a decade and a half, the rate of increase of blacks is much more rapid than that of the whites. It may very well be, therefore, given the greater press on blacks to go to colleges and universities, that 1974 will see a larger proportion of blacks than of whites entering institutions of higher learning.

The commitment of Americans to education, to return to the theme with which I began, has had a number of sources. One that should not be underestimated, even though its impact perhaps has declined, has been religion. Few realize that this country is the *only* predominantly Protestant nation in the world—by Protestant I do not mean state churches, such as Anglican, Lutheran, Greek Orthodox, or the like, but the Protestant sects, Methodist, Baptist, and others—the United States is the only country the majority of whose citizens have been or still are members of the

Protestant sects. The Protestant sects played a major role in pressing for an emphasis on education as a result of their beliefs in the individual's responsibility to personally interpret the Bible, to deal with God, and their insistence that an individual can only join the church as an adult, that he is not simply a birthright Christian. A Protestant adult was supposed to be aware of what he was doing, to have had some biblical education. This Protestant emphasis implied support for educational institutions, both the lower levels of education and a college system. Churches founded most of the colleges that existed before the Civil War.

A second source of support for widespread education has been ideological, the political emphasis stemming from the Revolution. The American creed, derived from the Declaration of Independence, has stressed equality, opportunity for all, and populism. This concern for popular control meant a need for trained citizens, citizens who were literate and could make use of the vote. The emphasis on equal opportunity, on achievement, as well as the related but separate stress on equality of manners and interrelationships also had as one consequence, a commitment to support the school system.

These concerns were particularly challenged by the recurrent need to assimilate foreigners, the tremendous horde of millions and millions of immigrants, many of whom could not speak English, many of whom were illiterate. This reinforced the pressure to create an educational system that would produce a common culture. Before the Civil War Horace Mann and others pressed for the common school. By the common school they sought what we call today an integrated school; that is, by common they meant common to everybody. Many argued that we could only have a united nation, that we could only have a democratic nation, if all children—whether they were the children of immigrants or native born Americans, of the rich or of the poor—went to the same school, were exposed to the same education, and interacted with each other.

Since Horace Mann's day, there have been large-scale deviations from this ideal, but the very fact that the goal was put forth at an early period, not just by the more "left" forces in the country, though they stressed it to some degree more than others, but by the conservatives and the Whig party as well, indicated the viability of egalitarianism. The strength of the emphasis on equality in the United States can be seen in an extreme form at an early period in our history in the programs of the Workingmen's Parties. These were the first political parties in the world which called themselves worker or labor parties. Karl Marx first derived the notion of a labor party from reading about these parties in the United States. They

had significant strength in a number of eastern cities in the late 1820s and 1830s. They focused on education, on equal education and equal educational opportunity, as something that the less privileged, the poor, the workers needed.

The New York State Workingmen's Party in a very eloquent document even argued that equal education in the public school system was not enough. Anticipating latter day reports of various sociologists, party spokesmen argued schools could not equalize chances for success since a much larger part of education occurred in the home, in the neighborhood, in the streets of the cities than in the schools; and these environments were high unequal. They concluded that the only way to have a society of equal opportunity—which they took for granted America ought to be—was by requiring all children to attend state-supported boarding schools from the age of 6 on. That is, they proposed that the children of the rich and the children of the poor should be forcibly required to spend 24 hours a day in a common environment.

This proposal, in effect, to nationalize the children, I would submit, is far more radical than any ever proposed by a communist, socialist, or anarchist movement in any other part of the world. Needless to say, it never bore fruit, but the very fact that it could be advanced by a party which elected candidates and which served 15 percent or more of the vote in the days of Jackson points to how seriously some Americans, even in that early time, took the notion of equality. The pressure from the early labor movement for equal opportunity subsequently contributed to the creation of one of our first important public schools of higher education, what is now the City College of New York, part of the City University of New York. The City College of New York was formed as the Free Academy in 1849 as a result, in large part, of demands from the labor movement.

The egalitarian thrust in American life which has placed its key emphasis in the extension of education is, of course, not simply one that has stressed education in and of itself, that is, to create literacy and other skills, as well as to socialize people into the system as good citizens. It has strongly reflected the belief of the Workingmen's Party that Americans, regardless of class or ethnic background, ought to be equal in a race for success. Our goal was, and to a considerable extent still is, equality, not of result but of opportunity. Every child should be able to start more or less equally in a race to get to the top but the race should be for unequal rewards.

The concern for equality here should be contrasted with an alternative

emphasis in Europe, where a very different policy framework was set many years ago. In Europe, the early equalitarian pressure, especially from the left and more equality-oriented political groups, was more towards equality of condition, moving the bottom up, improving the income and conditions of the poorer strata, rather than equalizing the race for success. This was pressed through early versions of what are now called welfare state measures, that is, transfer payments of varied kinds, social security, unemployment insurance, tax benefits of one kind or another, old age pensions, state medicine, public housing, and the like. Compared with America, much less attention was paid to improving the school system. Consequently many European countries down to recent years have had a two class school system, a very good one for the children of the relatively affluent, a mediocre one for the large majority. In France the bourgeoisie have *lycées*; in England the middle classes have the grammar schools and the public schools; in Germany and Sweden the privileged strata young have attended the *gymnasia*. The elite schools, the *gymnasia*, the *lycées*, and the grammar schools, were for five or ten percent of the population, that small proportion of the scions of the middle and upper classes headed for universities. The rest of the population, it was assumed, would remain workers and peasants and, hence, did not need a good education. They attended second-rate elementary schools, until they were 14. They either did not go to high school or went to a vocational one.

This differentiation, strangely enough, was not much opposed even by socialists and other leftists, until the last two decades, when, in reaction to increased awareness of the situation in this country, efforts started to integrate European schools. In Social Democratic Sweden, for example, the first significant measures to create common schools only occurred in the 1950s. For the two previous decades of socialist government there, Social Democratic politicians paid little attention to the effect that the two-tier school system had in limiting the proportion of workers' children who attended universities.

In the United States, the emphasis on improving the competitive situation of the less privileged in a race for success has continued. For example, the rationale of the Kennedy-Johnson war on poverty was stated in comparable terms to those used in the 19th century. Both the language and policies of the war on poverty were directed towards equalizing opportunity, not condition; that is, towards giving the deprived the skills and education to compete. The whole concept was one of providing *individuals* with the skills and motivation they had been denied by the environment of poverty. The black situation was defined somewhat dif-

ferently. This proved to be the first case where American society committed itself to help a *group*, but it still preferred to offer blacks improved individual chances rather than collective advantages. The stress on the skills of the individual was reflected in the emphasis on education, in the enormous expansion in the scope of high school education and college education so that they permeated underprivileged groups in the population.

The success of this system in its own terms may, of course, be seen in the rates of social mobility reported in various studies, particularly those concerned with movement into the privileged professional and bureaucratic echelons of business and government. These findings are generally ignored in the studies of mass mobility such as those reported in the Jencks book, *Equality*, which deal largely with mass data, with kinds of data obtained in national sample survey studies. Such surveys necessarily say little about access to higher status positions. Jencks, for example, denies increased education results in higher rates of social mobility. This conclusion, however, may be challenged by the results of surveys of the backgrounds of professionals and other privileged strata. Since, as Jencks correctly emphasizes, higher education has a credentialing function for more prestigeous jobs, in large part independent of school grades, its expansion inherently opens the door to significant advancement for the children of the lowly. The United States has the highest percent of college graduates in the world; it also leads in proportion of those from worker origins who have obtained positions requiring college degrees, that is, professionals.

This pattern may be seen in the results of comprehensive studies of the business elite as well. The leading scholar in this field, Mabel Newcomer, gathered data on the backgrounds of the top three officers of the largest 600 corporations as of 1964. She compared her results for that year with those she had previously obtained for 1950 and 1900. Dr. Newcomer found a steady decline in the percentage of Americans coming from wealthy families present in the business leadership. That occupational stratum included 46 percent from wealthy families in 1900, 36 percent in 1950, and only 10.5 percent in 1964. Even more significant, however, were the figures relevant to origin in families classified as "poor." In 1950, 12 percent of the members of the business elite came from families described as having lived in poverty. In 1964, according to her data, almost one quarter, one out of four corporate leaders, came from economically poor backgrounds. In large measure these changes within the business elite—not in the mass of the population—reflect the fact that reaching the

top of the corporate ladder increasingly involves starting as a college graduate. Those from poor families who are able to get a bachelor's degree *can* rise. The key factor is whether or not you attend college. If you go to college, you may not start equal to those from more affluent backgrounds but certainly you have a lot more chance than if you did not; you are in the race for the top. The increased rate of success of those from underprivileged families may also reflect the fact that there is a greater commitment to getting ahead among the educationally successful children of poor families than among those college graduates who come from privileged backgrounds.

The 1964 study also showed that the schools which were the largest producers of the business elite were not those regarded as the most elite schools in terms of social or academic status. Harvard or Yale or Princeton did not stand out as the primary sources of the corporate elite. The leading school was the University of Illinois followed by some other Big Ten schools. More members of the corporate leadership came from the big state universities than from the Ivy League. These differences are not simply a product of increased opportunity but also of the varying orientations towards careers stressed in the more and less educationally selective institutions. The more prestigeous schools influence students to choose careers in academe, to attend graduate school, rather than enter business. Hence we have a system under which the well-to-do send their children to educationally selective schools which do not value business or other narrowly vocational careers. And the scions of the privileged are, therefore, increasingly following academic, intellectual, and professional careers. Conversely many coming from working class and farm families who go to good state schools, and as first generation college students are ambitious to make money, end up replacing a large segment of the offspring of the economically advantaged in those positions perceived by young people primarily as ways of securing a large income.

The situation in the communist societies, which stress equality of opportunity as a goal has been quite similar until recently to that of the United States. The relevant facts have been reported in the many studies of opportunity and social mobility published by sociologists in the Soviet Union and other communist countries. These suggest that educational attainment is even more important under communism as a precondition for movement to the top, to a leading position, to power and prestige, than it is in this country. As a consequence, there is probably much greater emphasis on educational achievement in the Soviet Union than here. But given the concern of communist planned society for economic develop-

ment, as these countries, particularly the Soviet Union, have had to choose in recent years between educational policies which seemingly would stimulate economic growth and those which would foster equality of opportunity, they opt in favor of economic development.

This point is particularly relevant to the kinds of issues discussed under the heading of affirmative action programs and open enrollment in America. In the Soviet Union, the policy makers have explicitly rejected the equivalent of affirmative action; that is, they oppose proposals involving special privileges for people from culturally or class-deprived backgrounds. Admission to university is solely based on grades in exams, which, of course, correlate strongly with social class background. Consequently, with the increased difficulty of getting into universities in the Soviet Union, as the numbers graduating from high school grow much more rapidly than places in higher education, there has actually been a decline in the proportion of young people of working class and peasant backgrounds admitted to such schools, while an increased percentage of students come from middle and upper class intelligentia families.

The issue of growing inequality of access to higher education is both evaded and debated in Soviet academic literature and other places. Some answer the charge that they are producing a less equal educational system by simply arguing that to admit youth to universities who are less able educationally because they come from less privileged backgrounds wastes the resources of society. They contend that communist society cannot afford to give preference to the less qualified poor if it seeks rapid economic growth. In a real sense, current American educational policies involve a firmer commitment to equalitarian educational values than do those of the Soviet Union. And some Soviet sociologists acknowledge that rates of social mobility, both upward and downward, are declining in their country.

Although this discussion has emphasized the positive impact of American values and educational policies on opportunity, clearly the picture contains tremendous negative aspects not merely in society as a whole but within the educational system itself. The commitment to equality of opportunity or condition is very far from being carried out in practice. Among students of the same IQ or comparable academic abilities, as measured by test scores, there is considerable variation in actual educational achievement associated with parental income. Those from less privileged backgrounds get lower grades and are much less likely to go on to higher education. The correlations are quite similar to those in the Soviet Union.

In both countries, also, scholars find that transfer payments, the extent to which the community uses public revenues to help various groups, serve to benefit the children of the middle class more than the children of the poor, particularly within the education system. For example, 25 percent of the families of the United States, before transfer payments, are classified as poor. But those 25 percent who are poor receive only 18 percent of the benefits from education. "Free" education subsidizes the nonpoor more than the poor. As a total system of transfer payments, educational benefits the upper 75 percent much more than the lowest quartile. This class bias is even more apparent in elite public higher education. Such universities are used much more by the middle and upper-middle classes, then they are by the lesser strata. A similar point has been made by some Soviet scholars about the distribution of public resources in their own country. They point out that the scions of the intelligentia, of the more privileged groups, get much more benefit from their free higher educational system than do the children of workers and peasants.

To subsidize the nonpoor more than the poor in the educational system is clearly an unfair public policy. It violates both the generalized commitment towards equalizing the race for success and the belief that all groups should receive an equitable share of public benefits. It is impossible to argue that the poor should receive *less* in a given area of public expenditure than the well-to-do. In spite of the increased mobility into the elite made possible by the extensive American commitment to higher education, it should be obvious that there is considerable room for improvement before we can even begin to talk about approaching equality of opportunity.

I would like to conclude with a brief discussion of an issue that is obviously on the minds of many, if not all, of us at this conference. We are all bothered by the conclusions about the negative impact, or small effect, in advancing educational policies, integration, busing, Head Start, and so forth. Popular articles suggest pessimism about interventionist programs as the main implication of educational research. It should be recognized that such research is not wrong, it is not bad research, but the negative implications, the nonaction implications, are much exaggerated by lay discussants. This may be pointed up by the statistic I mentioned at the beginning of this talk concerning the equalization in entry to higher education between blacks and whites. The implications of this development are enormous, not simply for the evidence that higher education is becoming a more equitably distributed good, but because, as indicated, education is the critical credentialing mechanism.

To secure one of the better jobs in this society, it is necessary to go to college; if there is to be economic equality for blacks or any other group, the first place it must occur is in education, a state which we are now beginning to approach. The datum that the proportion of blacks entering colleges and universities has more than tripled in the last decade and that it is now the same as the proportion of whites may be viewed, therefore, as more significant than the negative results about the effects of various educational policies or achievement in grades or test scores. In a recent article in the *Harvard Educational Review*, James Coleman pointed to a parallel development, decade by decade over most of this century, between increases in educational equality and declines in income inequality. As education becomes more equitably distributed, so apparently does income within the American population as a whole. Educational investments have contributed to our success in economic development and to making possible upward mobility into professional and other elite positions. The record justifies these investments in materialistic economic terms, but if we evaluate them in sociological, that is egalitarian terms, they are even more justified.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF MINORITY CHILDREN

Julian Nava

I'm going to speak today in a more personal way than I often do when talking about Meeting the Needs of Minority Children. I was very impressed with the three earlier speakers and the insights they gave us regarding whether education makes a difference, the quality of higher education, measurement, and so forth. I think that my remarks should be taken as coming from an individual who is a number of things: a professor of history, a politician - each member of the Los Angeles Board of Education is elected from a constituency of close to two million people and we run at-large in Los Angeles - a parent, and a number of other things too.

I am, however, first and above all else an individual. When people ask me, "Who are you?" or "What are you?" I say, "I am Julian," and I really don't think I am a Mexican-American first. I look at someone else in a corresponding way; that is, as an individual. I grew up thinking as a Mexican-American. It was the Second World War experience that really made me free, because before that I was a Mexican in mentality. And although I described myself for the purposes of our meeting as a Mexican-American and as a Chicano activist, professionals like you should know that I am simply Julian. I hope and trust that all of us are here because we are working towards a state of mind and condition in our country, indeed the world, in which all of us would be first, and above all else, ourselves.

Unfortunately, we don't get the chance to be just ourselves most of the time, due to stereotypes. Usually I don't get a chance to be Julian first; I'm something else first. Coming up in the airplane I was reminded of this upon seeing a headline in the *Los Angeles Times* about how the AFL-CIO will give Chavez $1.6 million initially in the struggle that the United Farm Workers have underway against Teamster efforts to destroy the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee. As you may know, the UFWOC is now a member of the AFL-CIO. Yes, it's true that minority groups like Mexican-Americans really *do* face organized, large interest groups dedicated to keep them in a subordinate place. Another issue of the *Los Angeles Times* highlights the fact that a study shows patterns of job discrimination in the University of California system, not withstanding significant improvement in these respects in the system. It is still obvious that minority groups are at a great disadvantage in most respects in the

University of California system—and, indeed, one might say in the State University and College system and the Community College system as well. Access to education, so important to self-realization, and equality of opportunity are still severely restricted in California for Mexican-Americans, its largest single minority and the same follows for other minority groups in our country.

In this morning's *San Francisco Chronicle*, some of you may have read over breakfast a report by Dr. Myron Winick that poor nutrition early in life, indeed for the fetus, definitely produces a smaller number of brain cells. And the implication I draw personally is that, if this appears to be true, than I can revere the memory of my mother and my father all the more because, although my father was an uneducated man, he read widely and he was a health "nut." We had books on health all over the house—especially that wonderful set by Bernarr MacFadden. Remember? When you opened the book, those little folders on the body, the liver, and the heart came out. Those little diagrams just fascinated me. My mother and father were always—much to my annoyance—concerned about nutrition, what we ate at home and at school and with our friends. When my youngest sister was born, my father and mother watched her diet constantly: how much she ate and what she ate. I have just a vague recollection of this, but she ate a little differently than the rest of us. At a very simple level of understanding, many of us have known for a long time that prenatal conditions of the mother are likely to have a profound impact on the newborn child. We've surely known it about horses, which I love very much, but maybe we are only now beginning to prove scientifically that the same effect is found in Homo sapiens.

Now, I can't help but think when I look at a group like you, listening to someone like me, that you might very well be annoyed by the whole thing. I have often sensed in majority groups I've addressed, majority annoyance at the discussion of how we can better meet minority needs. I think that the annoyance I sensed in public meetings, although I don't expect it here because we are a self-selected group, stems from guilt recognition of what "we" have done to "them" or what "we" haven't done for "them." A fear of minority demands and that "we" may lose something if "they" get more.

What does Julian want? What does an Asian want? What does an Indian want? What do "they" want? I keep hearing such questions, since I'm a political animal and many don't recognize me as being a Mexican-American. Some majority people ask me whether I'm Spanish, as though seeking reassurance that I have not violated their stereotype of a Mexican-

American. Most people are just plain confused, and they don't know what to do about minority demands and needs. They really *don't* know what to do. Of course, many are just plain opposed to minority demands, consciously or unconsciously. They feel that they will be lessened by the elevation or improvement of the conditions of minority groups.

I've dwelt on this because I sense, at the university where I teach and the school district where I serve on the board and many other places, a growing resentment and a far more skillful resistance to job placement and advancement of minority groups than we have found before. As minority groups gain ground, I perceive more skillful opposition to their further advancement. One of our speakers this morning pointed out that the more education a minority group member has, the greater the disparity between his professional preparation and his salary as compared to a working class minority group member, to whom it's easier apparently to give more pay if not higher status.

Who is a minority group member anyway? I frankly believe it's a state of mind and not a physical condition. I have concluded from my own experience and the experiences of other people considered Mexican-Americans, Indians, Blacks, Asians, or Jews that it really is a state of mind. Being minority depends upon what you think you are and what others think you are. It takes agreement on the part of both parties to escape minority status, although conversely it takes only one of the two parties to establish it. That is to say, if I say I am free, an individual, an American, and a human being, that may or may not be enough unless you agree with me—if you help determine the conditions under which I function. It takes agreement on the part of the individual and the others to abolish the state of mind of being minority.

Functionally today, minority groups can be divided into two groups. The first would be groups like Blacks, Chicanos, and Indians—the larger, more dramatic minority groups. The second category would be such groups as women, religious groups, and socioeconomic groups such as the poor. Lately, I have felt a certain amount of resentment, which I have successfully overcome, against seeing more people join the minority ranks. When I conveyed my reaction to one of my Black friends, he said, "I'm glad you asked that question, Julian, because—damnit!—I sure was mad at you guys for awhile. We had a good thing going, and then you Chicanos started to rock the boat!" And, sure enough, at our university we had riots; students burned the president's office and did all sorts of other things until a practical solution was found to minority needs and the Black and Brown controversy. And what did the solution amount to on our

campus? Parity! So much for one group, so much for the other in money, positions, and so forth.

The solution did not last long, for the Indians have gotten restless. Now the pie has to be split three ways. And, as if the Indians were not enough, the women are joining the ranks of minorities. Since they outnumber us all, therein lies the real threat to the established minorities.

I really think we should do some hard thinking about who and what is a minority in our country. I believe that there are different types of minority groups and that their needs differ. The needs of some are more desperate, more immediate than the needs of other minority groups.

Let's shift attention now to schools. I would like to comment on some of the things that I've seen going on in schools and how these effect minority groups. Let me begin by asserting I don't know what schools teach! That may be an odd confession for a member of a board of education. But I *don't* really know what schools teach, after all is said and done. I am aware of far too many hundreds of thousands of pupils that graduate from high school, reading at grade level seven or lower, and with few math skills. Thus, I am led to ask, what *do* schools teach? What *do* they do for 12 years? Someone this morning told a story that ended with this line: "I taught you everything you know and you don't know nothing!"

If performance in the three Rs is used as the major set of criteria, then apparently schools do very little. It's a fair question: Would pupils have learned as much out of school? I recall that the most important things I learned in school did not come from books. They came from social experience, from the attitudes and values of the teachers—both the good ones and the bad ones. The bad ones told me to go into auto shop because it was a practical solution and a preparation for what lay ahead for me. They were making me an unwitting agent in a self-fulfilling prophecy, and, if it hadn't been for the Second World War, I probably would be, hopefully, a successful automobile repairman or maybe an entrepreneur. The good teachers told me things like, "Julian, no matter what happens, always try to do your best." One particular teacher, as I was graduating from elementary school, hugged me, kissed me on the forehead, and gave me a quarter—violating two sacred school board rules, three probably; the three violations were probably the most significant thing that happened to me in elementary school—body contact, showing of affection, and giving of presents. When I was that age, I hope to tell you, a *quarter* was a lot of money! I mean, it made my hand go down. As I recall, quarters were solid silver then.

I thought very seriously of dropping out of high school, and I sort of

half did. I took work-study because I didn't like high school, also because I felt shame at going to school when our family wasn't quite sure whether we were going to eat next week. Already by that age, I had a very well-developed sense of manhood. Past puberty, in our culture I was supposed to be working. Besides, school was so irrelevant to me; I was treated as a child but I knew I was a man.

So I left school and started to work. Guess where? Auto shops. And I earned good money. As I said before, it was that damned war that saved me. I knew I was going to be drafted, so an older brother, already in the service, said, "Go back to school and, never mind what your counselor says, take geometry and algebra and trigonometry. You will get better duties in the service." I listened to my older brother and took these courses and found myself getting As. The fact that I couldn't read and speak English well and didn't know math well made little difference in those subject areas, because you either could think and figure it out or you couldn't. You didn't depend upon those other things that are so heavily relied upon for measurement and advice and go down forever on your .um cards. I think, in short, that minority group pupils are affected more by the social experience in school than they are by a lot of the other things we are concentrating on. Not that these other things aren't helpful.

We must address more attention to who gets what from public education in America today. *Who* gets *what*. I have looked at about 15 different school districts within the last six months alone. I have sadly concluded that most school districts are governed to protect the social and political interests of the dominant group in the community. But it's not only that. Much of the educational activity is directed toward keeping certain groups in their subordinate place. I think that you would be surprised in your own community, as I was in our own school district, to see the resistance to helping minorities. Even among women I found resistance toward opening up inte,scholastic athletic competition to girls to lessen sexism in athletics. Some women leading girls' intramural and intraschool athletic activities were so brainwashed by the males who selected them and maintained them in their positions, or were so afraid for their positions, they were unwilling to speak up for their own sex. Due to leadership at the school board level, in our district we have devised a broad program of interscholastic athletic activities for women.

In Los Angeles we are also making a number of other efforts to reduce the inequity of some of our school programs. Yet I continue to believe that minority groups get the least benefits from public education. Furthermore, because they are less prone to practice birth control, they tend to

have the largest families, and since poverty appears still to be a self-perpetuating condition, they are losing rather than gaining ground. I know Mexican-Americans are losing ground despite the small numerical increase in those completing school, getting into colleges and professional schools, and gaining appointments for positions of some consequence. All these advancements are outstripped by the increase in population—and it's my impression the same is true of the Blacks. It has always been true of Indians.

I am less qualified to talk about women, because until recently I have been a member of the oppressing group. Just the other day I described someone as, "Oh, she's only a woman!" And I meant to say something else. The very language and words we use often make us unwilling accomplices to racism in its various forms.

Prejudice is often reflected in financial policies. I see, for example, that very few states have taken the steps we have taken in California to improve the way by which we supply funds for public schools. The outcome of the Rodriguez case in Texas was a most disheartening development, for it was, as one of our speakers pointed out earlier, a judgment made by no less than the Supreme Court, the highest tribunal in the land. The recent decision that school districts are not required to move toward equalizing funds among districts as long as students are not absolutely deprived of schooling means that very few states will be encouraged to equalize public financial support for public education. In effect, the "Nixon" Supreme Court has upheld unequal educational opportunity.

I recently clipped and made copies of an article in the December 1972 issue of the *Saturday Review* on how to beat Serrano. That is, rules for the rich. With very little ingenuity, the article says, the rich should be able to avoid sharing their wealth—even if it means packing up and moving to Florida. I've sensed this desire to avoid helping poorer districts in talking to school board members from affluent districts. Some of these colleagues did not know my bias, thus they revealed that many school districts are finding ways of beating the Serrano decision and of somehow maintaining privilege for some and, of course, disadvantage for others.

The same sort of thing is happening at the national level. President Nixon's realignment of priorities and the appointments to groups such as the National Institute of Education, most of which are business, cost accounting, efficiency expert types, lead me to say that I'm not as optimistic as some of our speakers this morning that much good can come from that Nazareth. Because the record of the people appointed to that group is not, today at least, promising. Minority groups are very, very

disheartened by what's going on at the national level, and also very disheartened by the credence given to people like Arthur Jensen and Christopher Jencks and the Coleman Report. We find there now appears to be an intellectual foundation for educational racism which will be appealed to by many unless we can have excellent talks such as we had this morning that put these findings into a better perspective.

Again, when I talk to school board members, I find many people breathing a great sigh of relief. "Ah-h-h! My God, at last someone has said that money in itself does not produce better education. . . So we're going to reduce the property tax rate in our district because here we have the proof money itself does not help children." And, of course, any reduction in overall expenditures in school districts will hurt minority children far more than it will hurt majority children.

So, frankly, I think all of us face a very great challenge if we wish to persuade decision makers to truly address themselves to the needs of minority youngsters. If only for enlightened self-interest, I will settle for their personal dislike if I can obtain a change in their conduct. To a great extent I personally have stopped trying to change the minds of people. There is little profitable outcome in relation to the energy I put out. I have settled for trying to alter conduct by trying to identify practices in school that we may all agree hurt minority children. And, in the absence of knowing what to do to help them, at least stop hurting them.

Although I have considerable faith in the native intelligence of most people, I have come to believe that if it hadn't been for the Second World War experience, public schools would have hurt me far more than they helped. And that was at a time when the Los Angeles City School District was rated as one of the better ones in the country. Public schools are still hurting minority children far more than they are helping, as indicated generally by the dropout rate, by the negative attitudes and low self-esteem evidenced by many minority children when they graduate from high school.

I think we must—as John Gardner said with respect to our nation—start asking the big questions, rather than simply tending that portion of the education machinery to which we are assigned—like the bus driver to whom one of our speakers referred, who was more interested in waking up his buddy so that he could see the accident than he was in taking the time to avoid the accident. It was a ridiculous story, but had a moral to it. Among the big questions that we will probably formulate is: Who governs public education and what for? If we find the answer to that big question, I think we'll find the answer to much of what does and doesn't go on in

public education. It is my impression on the basis of my own experiences that most school boards are interested in perpetuating the attitudes and values of the dominant adult majority. Necessarily, therefore, much in public education is obsolete. And it's tragic also to conclude that many of us in minority politics are trying to copy the majority–even though, as Henrik Ibsen said, "the minority is always right."

I would say that today there exist two kinds of minorities. Henrik Ibsen was saying in his still relevant play *An Enemy of the People* that the creative minority is always right but, by the time the majority realizes this, conditions have probably changed so much that a new minority is now right.

It's tragic to me that many fellow minority members in politics and I may still be committing the error of copying majority attitudes and values at a time when they no longer are really what we should be doing. Smart people appear to be leaving public education and sending their children to alternative schools, to private schools which are more student-directed, which are more flexible, which provide many options. Just when minority groups are trying to break into the power centers of established middle class American public education, much of it becomes irrelevant and doesn't meet the needs of children.

Decision makers like us, influential people like us everywhere, I truly believe, might be counted in Ibsen's creative minority. If we can verbalize at least how to stop hurting minority children by making them believe that they are inferior and by setting lower sights for them–if on the contrary we can encourage them, can help them, even if we don't know how to help them in complicated educational ways–we will be providing a very great service. I urge you to consider my particular conclusion–that rather than try to change the thinking of people, we should at least begin with a change in conduct.

WHAT TEACHERS CAN DO TO IMPROVE SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

David Selden

An article in the April 27th *Nation* by Professor Carleton Butts of Teachers College offers an excellent statement of the liberal position regarding the present and future of American public education. It's a well-written, well-conceived article, from my point of view, which ought to be duplicated and read by everyone. I call your attention to it because any discussion of what teachers can do to improve schools really must be put in context.

The American public school system, as we never cease telling ourselves, is unique. It was conceived as a massive attempt to make sure that members of the body politic, the populace of the United States, were sufficiently educated to do a good job of governing themselves. To this basic objective, of course, others were added, personal objectives of making it possible for children to achieve their maximum effectiveness, objectives of a vocational and generally cultural nature that go far beyond the original concept. But, basically, the unique thing about the American school system is that it was conceived as a mass enterprise. It has had, until recently at least, and probably still, the characteristics of any mass production enterprise in America.

Cost effectiveness has always been the controlling factor in educational policy. There are always things that you would like to do, but you don't do because they cost too much. There are other things that are embedded in the system because it's cheaper to do things that way. Children are taught in what are conceived to be teachable groups—or manageable groups—and they proceed along an educational assembly line. Teachers, too, are hooked into this educational assembly line, and at the elementary and secondary level, put in a standard in-school work week of 30-35 hours.

The supervising structure of American education, like any typical industry, is essentially bureaucratic; it has a chain of command and, although there are some little triangles and circles and squares connected by lines off to the side of the diagram, you can take an average school system, make a schematic of it, and compare it without labels to the schematic of a medium-sized business. They look very much the same.

American education has followed an institutional approach, and the

institution is at least as important as its purpose. Maintaining the institution really becomes the primary anxiety of most people in administrative positions within the bureaucratic structure.

Our school systems are also characterized as authoritarian. The constraints of the system almost force it to be because it's cheaper to be authoritarian than it is to be humanitarian. You can handle more people by being authoritarian. Administrators can handle more teachers and teachers can handle more students through an authoritarian approach. Finally, in order to facilitate the whole operation, a great deal of conformity is required. Nonconformity is expensive, because this means that the attention of rather high-priced employees must be given to small numbers of people, and the cost effectiveness of doing that is high. Consequently, people who require a lot of individual attention usually are just pushed out.

I have presented a greatly oversimplified or overgeneralized view of American education. To this concept must be added two recent overlays. One is the tremendous expansion of the system. It is no longer considered acceptable to neglect or refuse to teach members of minority groups. Some 50 years ago or 40 years ago, blacks, particularly those in rural areas, just didn't get much time in school; now we have a much higher percentage of black children in school, and this is one cause of enrollment expansion. Then there has been an expansion of the amount of time children stay in school. Before World War I, a sixth grade education was considered adequate in most areas; with the growth of community colleges and junior colleges, soon we will have 14 years of schooling as standard, even if we don't go down into earlier childhood education.

As for the other overlay, it concerns the impact of changes in American society since World War II. During and since World War II, the institutions that held American society together for so long lost their potency: the home, the church, and, yes, racism. The American institutions that held society together—some good, some bad—lost their effectiveness in controlling people, and our times have become more turbulent. Perhaps now, as we rest in the relative tranquility of the second Nixon administration, we may feel that things are getting quieter than they were in the sixties. I think that is largely an illusion and, even today, conditions are far more turbulent than they were 30-50 years ago; and schools, by a process of elimination, have become the most viable institution in American life. As a consequence, the problem of holding our society together, of advancing, of continuing our progress has devolved more and more on the schools. Although I believe that our schools are better now than they were 10 or

25 years ago or even 40 years ago, unfortunately the problems have increased much more rapidly than the solutions. So, while we have better schools, the problems the teachers have to confront are much more difficult.

Can the quality of education be improved by an act of sheer will? I doubt it. I don't think that the quality of education can really be improved very much without improving the investment in our schools. Let me amplify that a bit. I frequently get the question "What are you going to do about cleaning up your own house, about firing all those incompetent teachers?" Well, there are some obvious reasons why we have incompetent teachers. They were hired, in the first place, by somebody who didn't know how to judge teaching material very well, and they were retained by people who didn't know how to administer very well, and they are continuing to function because there's no one to take their place. If you fired every incompetent teacher in the United States and replaced him with somebody else that you thought might be more competent, the quality of education, in my belief, would be raised less than a percentage point.

The quality of education essentially rests on the amount of service that schools can provide to children, and the amount of service that schools can provide to children depends upon the availability of staff in the first place and the wise use of staff in the second place.

Now, what can teachers do to improve the quality of education? Quite obviously, the first and most important thing they can do is organize themselves properly so that they can demand the kind of support for schools that the schools are not getting today and really haven't gotten in a long time; I think that this is the first obligation of all teachers.

In a majority of the states, teachers still do not have collective bargaining, and that includes California, where we have no collective bargaining law. Without some way of organizing themselves, teachers really cannot be held accountable or responsible for progress in the schools. As a group, they must be organized properly in order to effectuate change, and collective bargaining is probably the best vehicle for group action to bring about changes in the schools.

But within the context of existing supplies of money, is there anything that can be done? There are a few things that occur to me. For the first time in many years, two years ago I took a week off from my job as an administrator of an educational organization and became a substitute teacher in Kansas City, Missouri. I damn near died. It's not that easy being a substitute teacher, anyway, and this was a particularly gruelling experi-

ence: a rusty, old, broken-down junior high school teacher going back and trying to make it.

One day during that week I found myself before a class of boys, an all-black class of about 35. Maybe there were some girls in the class, but I remember the boys because they were all bigger than I was. This was a class in modern history. These students were sixteen, pushing seventeen, and just waiting for that birthday to come when they could drop out. I was supposed to teach them about the rise of nationalism in Europe.

I've been a reader most of my life, a slow reader, but I keep working at it, and I've been interested in history, including 19th century European history. I had read widely in that field; I read everything that Emil Ludwig wrote, ponderous tomes not read any more. I read other historical accounts, and I read some of the literature, the English literature, particularly. I would say that my study in the field of 19th century European history probably exceeds that of at least 95 percent of the American population.

So, I opened the textbook and turned to questions in the back of the chapter. You know: Let's see what these kids are supposed to learn. I found that I could answer about half the questions without reading the chapter. And the thought hit me: What is this all about? Suppose I were to succeed in teaching this chapter to this group of boys, and that after working away at it, I got them so that maybe a majority of the class could pass a simple quiz on the material. What would that mean ten years from now—or one year from now? What is the relevancy? I really lost faith in that class, right at that point.

The demands that society was making on this group of boys were utterly unrealistic. They were demands that those kids really couldn't meet, and I could hardly blame them for not meeting them. Incidentally, when the boys came in, I found out that the regular teacher knew what he was doing. He didn't let them take their books home. The books were kept piled up on his desk. The kids came in and some of them grabbed the books from the desk and started throwing them to others, who caught them and then sat down, more or less. But it took me about 45 minutes to get the class in order, then the bell rang, and that was that. It really was a harrowing experience.

Yes, we waste a lot of time in school; perhaps that's one thing that we could think about. Maybe, to have schools that are humane, where teachers are expected to be creative and not automatons hooked into an educational assembly line, we must create time within the school framework for teachers to carry on these creative functions. One way of doing it

might be to eliminate a lot of the stuff that's in the curriculum. As a matter of fact, you could probably eliminate that whole history course.

Are there other ways of creating time? Schools spend a great deal of time and energy on fulfilling their custodial function. There is no reason to have compulsory study halls in high schools. Let them out. Free up the school a bit.

We might consider reducing the number of compulsory course offerings, too. This is a way, of course, to break the monotony, the time-consuming drudgery of high schools hooked into a year-course offering program or a semester-course offering program. Still another way to make time for teachers is to use paraprofessionals. The American Federation of Teachers has endorsed the use of paraprofessionals and we organize them, too; we welcome them. I don't think you have to have a master's degree to put on a kid's galoshes. I think there are a lot of things in school that teachers now spend time on that they shouldn't spend time on. Teachers should be free to do the creative things we would expect of them, and then they should be encouraged and led to do creative things.

We in the AFT keep talking about our more effective schools program, but the more effective schools program is at a dead standstill now, has been for a number of years, because it is a high staffing ratio program. The secret of its success is its rich staffing ratio, which at the elementary level provides free time for every teacher every day. There are four teachers to every three classes, and this, of course, encourages a team approach. It also encourages conferring among teachers, a problem approach rather than an institutional approach. Instead of fulfilling the requirements of the bureaucracy and making sure that the institution is intact, the accent is on problem-solving. Such schools are successful, but they cost about 50 percent more than other schools, and for that reason they have not expanded over the past four years in any of the places this has been adopted. Significantly, while some of those schools have not been any great shakes—just above-average schools—most of them do have a lot of innovative programs, a lot of conferring and creativity, and the atmosphere in those schools, the ones that we have set up in Chicago, Detroit, New York, and Baltimore, is well above the atmosphere in nearby schools with comparable student clientele.

What else could teachers do? There is something that has been happening in American schools, in some places more than others. There has been a shift in the status relationships in the schools. Originally, the industrial model was followed in schools; there were workers known as teachers and there were administrators or bosses or executives who told

teachers what to do and saw to it that they did it and gave them demerits if they didn't. This structure of education is breaking down because of the increased status that teachers have achieved, mainly through collective bargaining. I seriously question what Robin Farquhar said this morning—though he said it very well and gave me some food for thought. I seriously question the whole system of administrative credentialing. I think it tends to create a class structure in education that gets frozen because of the credentials. We should be striving to eliminate the status differences between the administrators and teachers and place more emphasis on the responsibility of teachers themselves for improvement of the educational process.

The most hopeful thing that has come along in this regard is the teacher center development, particularly in England. Of course, the English educational system was never as administrator-ridden as the American system. It was different—not necessarily better—in some respects worse because its objectives were much more limited. But for one reason or another, the status of teachers in the British system has been higher than it has been in the United States. The proportion of women in British teaching is less than in American teaching, and the low status of women in American society spills over into the teaching profession and has a depressing effect on the status of teachers. I don't want to put any women out of work, but we might think of increasing the percentage of males in American education.

Essentially, the things the teachers can do really rest on their ability to organize, to mobilize power. The history of American education has been a constant struggle between people who don't want to pay more taxes for the support of schools and other people who are involved in schools in one way or another, either as parents or as teachers, trying to get enough money to improve the system, to keep it running, to help it function properly. Teachers constitute almost the only group with an interest in education that has the capability of developing sufficient power to bring about the necessary changes in the support levels.

Administrators as a group don't have enough power. They have great prestige in their communities, but this is not a substitute for power.

Parents are a transitory group. For most people, being a parent is a transitory condition and it usually doesn't last much beyond the elementary school. Once you get your kid through elementary school or junior high school, you feel you've done what you can. At least that's the history of the parent-teachers' associations. The group probably wouldn't be organized at all if it weren't for the school bureaucracy. The organization of parents' associations traditionally has rested upon the principals and the

superintendents of schools who help the parents organize.

Students, too, are transitory groups, very difficult to organize and, although they have burning interests at the college level, their organizations tend to be loose and without consistent energy or purposes.

The one group with sufficient need and critical mass is the teachers. The 3 million teachers in the United States, properly organized, could constitute a tremendous political and economic force. How should that force be used? Well, I believe in the strike but I'm not strike-happy. I believe that when you have the ability to refuse to accept the terms and conditions offered by the boss, you automatically get negotiations. If you don't have that ability to refuse to accept, you very seldom get negotiations. This is probably the first thing on which teacher power rests, but political action is another source of possible power.

Also, teachers do not develop their professional potential, do not insist upon the respect to which their position in the school system and in society entitles them. It would probably improve the quality of teaching if teachers had more respect for themselves.

There are some other things that I might mention—and get myself in trouble here, especially with this audience. For instance, for some reason or other, I feel uneasy about curriculum development specialists. People who have, some way or another, escaped the classroom now spend their time writing about it or drawing up outlines. I would rather find teachers free to do this kind of work themselves, willing to take this kind of responsibility. There's a danger in overspecialization. The idea that you can train a teacher who wouldn't be able to teach in a middle class school to teach in a ghetto school is strange to me. There are plenty of teachers who might be able to get along in a structured middle class school who couldn't do it in a ghetto school, true enough, but maybe they are not sufficiently skilled to be teachers at all. That brings me to my final point.

I'd like to think of a body of teachers with competency, meaning "able to perform in a behavioral sense," but I would also like to think of a teacher work force or a teaching profession with a degree of intellectual attainment. I don't know if it's possible to take 3 million people out of a work force of 80 million with high intellectual attainment and put them all in education. You might have to dip down lower than I would hope, but I think we must stop recruiting teachers from the lower thirds of the graduating classes of second-rate institutions.

Teachers really have not believed that they can grasp their own destinies—and this is what we must lead them to do. When they do so, perhaps their destinies will become much brighter than they now appear.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW TRENDS IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS*

Robin H. Farquhar

The implication of including a presentation on the preparation of educators in a conference on improving school effectiveness is that better training of teachers and administrators can effect better education. Let's take the bull by the horns right away and ask whether or not this is so. The answer, I'm afraid, is that we don't know. Let me be a bit more specific:

(1) To begin with, we're not agreed on what good teaching is, and we're not sure what good administration is; we are sure that what appears to be good teaching or administration for one child or class, or in one school or community, does not necessarily succeed with other, different children or societal contexts; one simple illustration of this confusion emerges from some of our research which demonstrates that a group of administrators, having observed films of teachers in classroom situations, will render widely varying evaluations of the same teachers' performances.[1]

(2) Secondly, even if we do reach some agreement on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes which we would like teachers and administrators to possess, we are not convinced as to the best ways of inculcating these characteristics in our training programs. The most appropriate combination and sequence of study and practice, of academic and professional content, and of theory and application in preparation are still subjects of heated debate in professional schools.

(3) And finally, no matter what kind of preparatory programs we settle on, we have no confidence that professional preparation *per se* makes any difference anyway; the cult of amatuerism–the suspicion that good teachers and administrators are born rather than made–still lurks darkly beneath the surface of education. With respect to instruction, "several research studies show that credentialed persons are no better

*The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Betty-Anne Gorbet and Janet C. Parker, both of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, in the preparation of this paper.

> teachers than comparably educated or skilled people without teacher training," and that success in university programs bears little relation to teacher performance.[2] With respect to administration, "research has failed to show that leadership training makes organizations more effective. No one has established a consistent, direct correlation between the amount or type of a leader's training and the performance of the group he leads."[3]

Having thus discredited the validity of anything further I might say on the topic I've been assigned, I'm tempted to sit down and let you get on with the remainder of this morning's program.

However, I'm going to resist that temptation. I am convinced that there are some teachers and administrators who are better than others; I am convinced that there are characteristics of better teachers and administrators which can be identified and which can be developed in preparation programs; and I am convinced that professional training experiences can be designed which will have an impact on the improved performance of educators. The fact that we have not yet found irrefutable proof in support of that last conviction should not cause us to abandon the quest. Rather, some recent progress in analyzing our problems and generating a few promising approaches to solving them should cause us to redouble our efforts.

It is in this spirit that I'll examine briefly some of the current trends and issues in the preparation of educators. In so doing I'll limit myself to professional training for teachers and administrators, although some of the generalizations I develop may be applicable to other educational roles as well. In discussing teacher training, I'll draw somewhat on the work of Paul Olson and his Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers[4]; in discussing administrator preparation, I'll draw largely on my own work with the University Council for Educational Administration.[5] I'll consider, first, some of the major problems in the preparation of educators; then I'll look at a few promising developments in response to these problems.

Major Problems

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there are problems in the preparation of educators when one notes the titles of such recent publications as Martin Haberman's article, "Twenty-three Reasons Universities Can't

Educate Teachers,"[6] and James Bowman's monograph, *The University Can't Train Teachers.*[7] While both of these titles are sensational, they convey an unjustified message. Universities have, and will continue to have, an important role in preparing educators. There are, nevertheless, major problems in their current efforts. These problems fall into three main categories: (1) irrelevance of content, (2) commonality of programs, and (3) inadequacy of screening. Let us take a quick look at each of these topics.

Irrelevance of Content

The first problem exists both because much of the content currently in preparatory programs is not relevant to the concerns of contemporary educators, and because much of the content that is relevant has not been incorporated into professional training. In the first instance, programs for both teachers and administrators currently depend largely upon the offerings of liberal arts departments whose faculties have little understanding of, or concern for, the nature and needs of schools. Teacher training is rapidly becoming either a one-year chaser to an undergraduate cocktail in the liberal arts, or a four- or five-year sequence in which liberal arts courses account for up to 80 percent of the content. Administrator training, in an equally quixotic quest for academic respectability, has bought the social sciences wholesale, and many programs now require a substantial minor in sociology, economics, or political science. While these developments represent improvements over the traditional methods and techniques courses of teachers college fame, they are based on expectations which liberal arts department can't meet. A sociologist or linguist owes his allegiance to sociology or linguistics. He embraces school administration or instruction at his professional peril. Thus, our education students must squeeze mightily to distill professional applications from much of the academic content they encounter during our preparation programs.

On the other hand, colleges of education have not tapped well the source of much content that is relevant to their programs—the schools themselves. Working relationships between school systems and universities are still generally dismal. Illusory, short-term practice-teaching sessions and irresponsible, shadow-type administrative internships continue to be the predominant reality components of preservice preparation. Thus, the gap between knowledge and action in our programs remains, and our students graduate with little awareness of the complexities of operating in an environment where deprivation is rampant, where minorities predominate,

and where schools and communities must build each other. Some of our programs, in fact, haven't even caught up with such erstwhile innovations as team teaching, differentiated staffing, individualized instruction, or open education. And it is rare to find adequate attention given in training to the development of affective skills, value clarification, conflict management, and other capabilities essential to the success of today's educator.

Commonality of Programs

A second major problem in preparation programs is their commonality. We are well aware of individual differences among children and of wide variations among communities; yet we typically train all our teachers and all our administrators to fit the same molds. Two graduates of a large state university—one destined to teach in an upper-middle-class suburb and the other headed for a ghetto classroom—will have experienced almost identical preparation experiences. Two Ph.D.'s from a university department of educational administration—one aspiring to an urban superintendency and the other committed to a career of scholarly research—will have experienced little differentiation between their doctoral programs. Nor is there much meaningful specialization among institutions. The high-prestige private institution in the East, the large urban university in the Midwest, and the small rural college in the South all offer pretty well the same preparation for educators. They all want to train everyone for everything. The result is that few are trained well to do anything.

There are several reasons for this. One is found in current financing schemes for higher education which allocate dollars according to the quantity of students rather than the quality of graduates—despite large surpluses of trained teachers and administrators. Another is the prestige that is assumed to attend comprehensiveness of programming, a factor that leads to the sacrifice of depth for breadth in offerings. But perhaps the most significant reason for commonality is the lack of conceptual frameworks for designing training programs; professional preparation in education is not well rationalized, so we lack systematic bases from which to develop functional differentiation and specialization among our programs.

Inadequacy of Screening

The third problem I'll consider is the inadequacy of approaches to screening our students—both at the point of recruitment and selection into our programs and at the point of graduation and certification for the job

market. Recruitment and selection of teacher trainees are virtually non-existent. Given minimal academic requirements, we'll accept any warm body that applies, and we never even check to make sure how warm it is. Thus, teacher trainees are seldom among the top quarter of university students in terms of intellectual ability. But more importantly, we make almost no effort to screen our applicants in terms of their affective qualifications, despite the existence of several instruments for doing so. With respect to administration students, our recruitment efforts are extremely haphazard. Our selection criteria are based almost exclusively on academic records, and these are rather uninspiring because our pool is usually limited to those who were previously in teacher training programs.

But this doesn't matter much because nobody really checks to see what our students can do when we're through with them anyway. As long as our programs are accredited by state, regional, or national agencies, and as long as we say a student has passed, he can get certified as acceptable for employment as a teacher or administrator. Some jurisdictions require passing grades on nationally-normed tests of general and professional knowledge, but what a graduate can do with what he knows is not really determined until he performs on the job—where he has real kids as guinea pigs and a strong union to protect his tenure.

Promising Developments

Well, this kind of self-flagellation has gone far enough. It is good fun for us academics to stand up and throw darts at ourselves and those with whom we are associated. But it is irresponsible if we don't attend to alternatives that offer solutions to the problems that we, and other social critics, love to talk about. It is a credit to the ingenuity, skill, and courage of educational practitioners and policy makers that, despite numerous disadvantages, they have historically responded in ways that have maintained the leadership position of this nation. They have sometimes been late and they have sometimes been wrong, but by and large they need not be ashamed of their record.

We may view the problems that currently confront us as the worst we have ever faced, and we may be right. But we have a pretty good idea of what they are, we're doing our best to analyze them, and we're coming up with some developments that hold promise for resolving a few of them. Let's take a short look at half-a-dozen of these developments: (1) university-school interaction, (2) in-service emphasis, (3) competency-based

orientation, (4) new recruitment initiatives, (5) new program content, and (6) new instructional technologies.

University-School Interaction

School systems and practicing educators are beginning to emerge as full partners with universities in the preparation of teachers and administrators. We find practitioners increasingly being employed as extramural instructors in education courses and as clinical professors in such places as Simon Fraser University in British Columbia and Northwestern University where master teachers from nearby schools are employed half-time as faculty members in the School of Education.[8] We find practice-teaching assignments traditionally required in the final year of training giving way to longer periods of internship in a variety of school settings, beginning as early as the freshman year. It has been proposed, in fact, that school systems take over the major role in teacher training from colleges of education, with the total community serving as a context for training and the total university serving as a supportive resource. This kind of clinical model has been tested in the Portland Urban Teacher Education Project at Adams High School.[9] We also find prospective administrators undergoing rotating internships in which they assume responsibilities for a few weeks in each of several relevant locations such as state education agencies, city planners' offices, welfare bureaus, and police departments.[10]

In-Service Emphasis

The current surplus of teachers and administrators, and the rapidly changing problems faced by practicing educators, have led to a much greater emphasis on in-service programs than in the past, and here too the locus of action and control is gradually shifting from the universities to the schools. Intensive, on-site professional development experiences for teachers are becoming common, and year-long internships for practicing urban school administrators are being sponsored both by school systems and by major foundations such as Danforth and Rockefeller.[11] A new humility is required on the part of universities that participate in this in-service thrust, for they must learn to listen in school communities and become aware of their own limitations or risk rejection.

Competency-Based Orientation

A reorientation of focus from content to competency is beginning to emerge in the preparation of educators. This has resulted in part from a challenge to universities to practice what they preach about behavioral objectives, but, more significantly, it stems from decisions in some states (such as Texas) to introduce performance-based certification in the near future. We can foresee the day when a teacher or administrator will emerge from university training with a descriptive certificate, specifying the social milieus and the kinds of children with which he is qualified to work. This possibility has led to near panic on the part of some institutions as they strive to identify desirable competencies and ways of developing them, and it has resulted in sheer hypocrisy on the part of others that claim their programs are competency-based when they are no such thing. Some progress in this direction is being made, however, through the development of mini-course modules designed to build specific skills—both for teachers (for example, at Illinois State)[12] and for administrators (most notably at the University of Utah).[13] Such modules tend to be highly individualized, with students selecting from among those available on the basis of their unique needs and aspirations; and many of them are self-instructional.

New Recruitment Initiatives

A less recent, but equally significant, development is the initiation of new recruitment strategies by schools of education. For about a decade, special emphasis has been placed on recruiting and admitting Blacks into training programs for both teachers and administrators; within the past three or four years this effort has been targeted as well at Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians. While the hope of staffing schools which serve minority group children with high proportions of teachers and administrators who speak their language and understand their culture has not yet been fully realized, some progress in this direction is evident. The career ladders associated with differentiated staffing are also contributing in this respect. With particular reference to recruitment for administrative preparation, two other developments are worth noting. One is a campaign to increase the proportion of women being trained in school administration. The other is an effort to bring into education individuals who have demonstrated high leadership ability in other kinds of organizations. This latter endeavor is best reflected in the National Program for Educational

Leadership, a five-university project funded by USOE which is designed exclusively to recruit into school administration established leaders in such fields as law, social work, the ministry, business, industry, and government service.[14] In the face of substantial skepticism, this program is experiencing considerable success.

New Program Content

Three main trends are evident with regard to program content for preparing educators. One is an effort to close the theory-practice gap. In administrator training, the social sciences are still viewed as highly relevant and the majority of students continue to be sent "across campus" to take courses in the disciplines. Increasingly, however, we find new offerings emerging which are oriented to problems in educational administration, with content being drawn from the social sciences through interdisciplinary seminars which adopt as a primary focus the nature of a problem rather than the structure of a discipline. Similar approaches to the liberal arts have been proposed for teacher training, but the results there are less encouraging so far. A second trend is toward the introduction of new content, with particular attention to the affective domain. Programs in both teaching and administration now include many more sensitivity training and value clarification experiences than they used to, and courses in educational futurism, cross-cultural communication, and the humanities are gaining popularity, particularly in administrative preparation. The third trend, primarily in administration programs, is toward the introduction of content drawn from business management and public administration. Systems analysis, PPBS, operations research, and information science are now familiar topics to many administrators-in-training.

New Instructional Technologies

Finally, we should acknowledge the use of new instructional technologies in the preparation of educators. The lecture-and-textbook approach is giving way in teacher training to microteaching, microcounselling, problems laboratories, and simulation.[15] In administrator preparation, we have graduated from case studies to comprehensive (sometimes computer-assisted) simulation workshops and more sophisticated forms of gaming. These developments represent the converse of internships and clinical programs in that they attempt to bring the realities of the schools into the university classroom where they can be dealt with in a deliberate,

analytical, and risk-free manner. Together, these two opposite approaches, along with all the other developments I have discussed, comprise a major effort on the part of universities to provide training experiences which will produce educators who at least have a fighting chance at improving school effectiveness.

Conclusion

I have had to be uncommonly brief in this presentation, and I'm sure I have neglected several important trends and issues in the preparation of educators. Nevertheless, I think I've given some of the flavor of what's happening in this area. I've tried to show that there are problems in training of which we are aware and that new developments are emerging which hold promise for resolving some of these problems.

However, lest we leave this subject feeling that all's well and eventual success is certain, let me conclude by pinpointing three pervasive problems that continue to vex us and to which I can foresee no early solution:

(1) *Credentialling.* As long as the power of certification rests with a combination of such insensitive institutions as universities, state departments of education, and regional and national accrediting agencies, our ability to provide particular local school systems with the unique kinds of expertise they require will be severly hampered.

(2) *Evaluation.* Until we develop procedures for evaluating, with predictive validity, the effectiveness of our training programs in terms of our graduates' performance, all of our new developments will be incremental stabs in the dark.

(3) *Rigidity.* No matter what changes we would like to make in training programs, there will always be a lag between the needs of schools and the responses of universities, because the obstacles to innovation which we face in our own institutions are immense.

If we can ever solve these three problems, then we shall truly have cause to rejoice.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

[1]Research currently being conducted, but not yet published, by Edward Hickcox and Glenn Scott, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

[2]R. Barker Bausell and William B. Moody, "Are Teacher Preparatory Institutions Necessary?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. LIV, No. 5 (January 1973), p. 298.

[3]Fred E. Fiedler, "The Trouble with Leadership Training Is That It Doesn't Train Leaders," *Psychology Today*, Vol. 6, No. 9 (February 1973), pp. 23-24.

[4]See especially, Paul A. Olson, "The Preparation of the Teacher: An Evaluation of the State of Art," *Education for 1984 and After*, eds. Paul A. Olson, Larry Freeman, and James Bowman (Lincoln: Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, 1972), pp. 16-48.

[5] Cf. Robin H. Farquhar and W. Michael Martin, "New Developments in the Preparation of Educational Leaders," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. LIV, No. 1 (September 1972), pp. 26-30.

[6]Martin Haberman, "Twenty-three Reasons Universities Can't Educate Teachers," *The Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. XXII, No. 2 (Summer 1971), pp. 133-140.

[7]James Bowman *et al.*, eds., *The University Can't Train Teachers*, (Lincoln: Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, 1972).

[8]William R. Hazard and B.J. Chandler, "The Clinical Professor in Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. LIII, No. 6 (February 1972), pp. 370-371.

[9]John L. Parker, "The Portland Urban Teacher Education Project: New Context for Teacher Preparation," *The University Can't Train Teachers, op. cit.*, pp. 83-90.

[10]See, for example, Anthony M. Cresswell and Robert J. Goettel, "Rotating Internships and Situational Analyses," *UCEA Newsletter*, Vol. XI, No. 3 (February 1970), pp. 7-9.

[11]See, for example, Laval S. Wilson, "Training Minority Men for the Superintendency," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. LIII, No. 3 (November 1971), pp. 187-188.

[12]Howard Getz *et al.*, "From Traditional to Competency-Based Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. LIV, No. 5 (January 1973), pp. 300-302.

[13]Lloyd McCleary, "The Development of a Competency Based Individualized Program," *UCEA Newsletter*, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (December 1972), pp. 2-4.

[14]Luvern L. Cunningham and Rod Muth, "NPEL—The National Program for Educational Leadership," *UCEA Newsletter*, Vol. XII, No. 3 (February 1972), pp. 9-12.

[15]See, for example, Donald R. Cruikshank, "Simulation," *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 7 (December 1968), pp. 190-193.

EQUALITY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Paul N. Ylvisaker

The dominant mood in education these days seems to be one of skepticism and weariness. We seem disenchanted with old formulas, tired of experimenting with new ones.

If that's to be our mood, I wish at least it could be relayed with a bit of self-effacing humor. My own motto these days came from a desultory conversation I overheard one night while awaiting a late-night train in Newark. One off-duty crewman was rebuking another—and in frustration, finally burst out: "I've taught you everything you know, and you don't know nothing!"

I confess I share Jim Guthrie's skepticism about some of the conclusions that have been drawn about American schooling by the current crop of educational skeptics. Nay-saying comes easily; but we may be stuck for a disastrously long time with a public policy which conveniently finds its rationale in such negativism.

The same doubting questions that have been addressed to elementary and secondary schooling are now being asked of American higher education. In this case, "Does it promote, or promise, equality?"

I come to the question as an "outsider"—or, at least, as a latecomer to the disputation. This assignment has prodded me into reading the literature. There are growing mountains of it, signalling the contagion of doubt which is trailing the "baby bulge" as it exploded its way through the successive levels of American education.

Viewing it in that perspective, I've found the literature lacking in many respects. As I'll indicate later, it misses a number of larger questions that ought to be asked.

The most basic and persistent question which is—and should be—asked, is: "Do 'they' (the minorities, women, ethnics, poor, and so forth) get their fair share of "it' (meaning schooling and the benefits that supposedly flow from it)?"

The answer given is "obviously not."

The literature, you'll notice, concentrates on the age groups conventionally associated with higher education: i.e., 18-22. It also equates educational benefits with economic rewards: i.e., jobs and money.

We'll talk more about those assumptions later. For now, let's accept them and review the patterns of inequality which can be found in American higher education.

These patterns of inequality have to be traced against the broad canvas of historical movements toward mass education and equalizing access. That trend is dramatic: between 1900 and 1970, the percentage of American 18-21 year-olds enrolled in institutions of higher learning soared from 4 to 47. But that great leap toward democratization simply accentuated the concern about remaining inequalities.

Pamela Roy has bitingly demonstrated one of these: the historical and persistent discrimination against women. Her change, amply documented, is that American society has educated its women whenever—and usually only to the extent and as long as—it needs them in jobs left open by shortages of manpower. Wartime is a predictable reason for expanding educational opportunities for women; and peace usually brings retrenchment.

Even when educational opportunity expands, women do not get paid as well as similarly educated men. In 1950, women's income—equated for jobs and education—was only 53 percent of that received by men. By 1970, that ratio had *fallen* to 44 percent while, ironically, the percentage of women, both white and non-white, attending college was steadily rising.

Inequalities plaguing blacks are also deep and long-standing, with mixed signs of how rapidly they are ameliorating. The percentage of blacks, both male and female, in the age group of 18-21 who are attending college, is rising and nearly approximates whites. (The percentage for white males dropped markedly—and almost to the rising rate for black males—in the last two years.) But studies by Blau and Duncan show that (at least until very recently) better-educated blacks lag further behind more poorly-educated blacks in the income they earn as compared to whites of equivalent education. In other words, from the standpoint of income parity, education hurts rather than helps.

The pattern for other minorities is very akin to that of blacks. Non-whites and Spanish-speaking now account for 10.6 percent of the college population, somewhat less than their ratio to the total United States population, with black attendance rates running ahead of those for Spanish-speaking and Indians. Incidentally, this overall minority rate drops to 7.5 percent in graduate school—indicating a marked fall-off at the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

educational levels where professional and income advantages are secured. Again, while attendance rates for minorities are increasing, income differentials between similarly educated minorities and whites persist, often more starkly in the case of Indians and Spanish-speaking than in the case of blacks.

One of the inequalities masked by aggregate figures of rising college attendance is the disparity between systems of higher education. The newer (especially two-year community) colleges have absorbed much of the growing population, particularly minorities and other "first-generation" college students.[1] The tendency is to establish a two-track system: selective colleges remaining (and perhaps becoming more) elitist, and community and "newer" colleges short-circuiting their growing minority and ethnic constituencies into vocational education and careers of less status and earning power.

Inequality is especially apparent between rich and poor. Studies consistently show that if you're smart and rich your chances of getting into college are about 9 to 1; if you're smart but poor, your chances are cut in half. If you come from a family whose income is less than $5,000 your chances of getting to college are four times less than someone whose family income is $15,000 or better. And these income disparities tend to set patterns and reinforce each other. Research indicates that young people who go to work rather than go to college wind up by being less "autonomous"—i.e., capable of handling yourself in an increasingly rugged and lonely culture. Those who are poor also are less likely and/or willing to borrow if that's the only way to get to college—and with the trend toward user-charges and pay-as-you-go, borrowing is becoming almost an essential for college and graduate school attendance.

Records also indicate that the dropout rates are higher among the minorities and the poor.

And as long as we're summarizing the literature on higher education and inequality, we might as well note some other "disadvantages."

If you're married, live off campus and/or drive a car, you're much more likely to drop out of college. More significantly, perhaps, you'll not be as much affected by what college seems to do to other students. Notably,

[1]You may be interested in some of the Harvard rates. The overall minority percentage in Harvard College is 8.4—2.2 less than the national average. For the graduate schools, the overall percentage is 7.6—.3 higher than the national average. Our figure in the Graduate School of Education is 22 percent—rising to 25 percent in 1973-74.

you won't become as "liberal," which may or may not be judged a guarantee of college and later blessings.

From this point on the literature takes you into some strange and wondrous territory—and it made me begin asking whether there aren't more startling inequities in American higher education.

For example, there's the finding that bright students "make it" just about as well whether they go to the "better" or less selective colleges. Then why pay the difference? What "value added"?

Also the studies which show no significant correlation between performance in college and later performance on the job—and later earnings.

And way out: the Georgia study which suggests that in fact "A" students learned no more than students who got "D's" and even "F's."

All of which should start a bright, hard-working ivy-leaguer wondering why he (or his parents) went to all that trouble and money.

It could be particularly disconcerting to a minority student beginning his arduous trek up the academic ladder, persuaded that social and economic rewards awaited him bountifully at the top. And acutely so at the beginning of a decade when college graduates will be several millions in surplus.

As David Riesman has put it, college education these years looks like an escalator leading to an abyss.

For the most part, the literature leaves off where these and some other haunting questions begin. I wonder whether more of the same is going to give us much help in finding answers.

For one thing, much of what I've read is dominated by a parochial, almost theological concern with what I'm inclined to think are passing issues. It may be revealing to say so, but I can't get seriously involved in the acrid debate over whether open enrollment, or other means by which access to higher education is being expanded, inherently threaten our capacity to learn and teach well. But the question of quality vs. equality is a red flag which presently excites a charge from a lot of academic bulls. Hopefully, the studies by Torsten Husen and his colleagues—though they cover secondary rather than higher education—will dispel much of what I regard as spurious disputation over the effects of mass education on quality (they show that the best students do better in that milieu).

Obviously, there are serious matters worth discussion—the speed and character of movement toward equalized access; the need to guard against exploitation of equality by hustlers of the movement—both pro and con.

Another dead-ending feature of some of the literature I've searched is the over-emphasis, I think, on quantitative measurement. Rigor is desirable; correlations are the beginning of insight. But much of what's to be questioned and contemplated goes far beyond what statistical series are either available or relevant. And there are huge unexplained leaps in recent quantitative commentaries on American education that we can't allow to be hid by statistical manipulation and legerdemain.

A third quality I find troubling in the literature is its current negativism—which in turn seems to fall in too easily and conveniently with political trends now in vogue. Undeniably, this is a time of public disenchantment with education—or more accurately, perhaps, with paying the rising costs of education. Also, it's time to cut through some of the nonsense that our passing affluence could afford. But we're at a point in American cultural and educational development where some positive and creative analysis is needed, to go beyond the obvious criticisms, to state why it is that the instinct for expanding educational opportunity might be justified and for reasons that speak to more than economic goals and in more than quantifiable terms. It's essential, in that broader sense, to start where human beings aspire for education rather than from some of their past and current disappointments.

The significant part for me is not that the nation is saying no to so much of what has passed for education—but that its demand for education—viewed more generally—is on the rise. Our eye ought to be on the nature of that rising demand.

What's misled us, is that we've been listening to the no's, not the yes's. Since they're said more uncertainly and quietly, the yes's are harder to be sure of. But these are some of the positive things I hear:

First, in a postindustrial society, learning and relearning are essential to survival. What's known changes and multiplies rapidly; and you can't make a living or a life without knowing. The service and knowledge industries, in the postindustrial society, are the growth and prestige industries; mind is their stock in trade, not muscle. The service industries are antiequalitarian, medieval, and monopolistic in their historical posture. Entry into the guilds and professions is restricted; regulation is self-regulation; and preprofessional training, whether in medical schools or craft apprenticeships, tends to be limited to the chosen few, whether the sons of plumbers or the favorites of tenured faculties.

Therefore, a postindustrial society's concern for equality *must* be pervasive if all its elements are to be at one with its conditions for survival. And that society will have to scrutinize, with eternal vigilance, the terms on which access is assured in every branch and at every level of relevant education.

Second, the demographic realities of our population tell us a lot about the emerging educational imperatives. The "baby bulge" is now exiting from the conventional ages and institutions of American education. Its last hurrah is being said in the expanding graduate school enrollment of 1973-74—more than we expected it to be, simply because the nation has provided that generation with no other challenging alternatives.

But let's not be misled by this episode of enlarging graduate schools into a false definition of that generation's rising educational demand. It will not be—at least for this decade—a reaffirmation (or denial) of the needs of conventional school systems. They (the 25 - 34 year-olds) will not be in college, nor for a while will their kids be attending elementary and secondary schools.

Their kids, the relatively few that they will have, will be in "early childhood"—and we already are seeing a vast increase in this cohort of parents' concern for equal access to quality preschool care.

They, the parents, will be out of college and on their increasingly lonely own, trying to adjust and readapt to changing times, changing circumstances, and changing life styles. They will be wanting and demanding attention to their needs for learning and relearning, in unconventional forms, in unconventional settings. Recurrent education—a lifetime punctuated by periods of learning—will be the hallmark of the new demand.

We will see—perforce—an intergenerational competition for educational resources—a competition already evident in the postindustrial communities of Europe. And our institutions of higher education will aid and abet the newer forces—simply because their enrollment of conventional age groups will be declining, and they'll have to fill their emptying spaces.

To compete, they'll have to adapt to a different set of expectations and learning styles. They'll have to be more market- and consumer-oriented—running a college will be a lot more like running a business enterprise. And that market orientation, ironically, is going to be one of the more powerful forces leading to a greater democratization of higher education.

Similarly, the "aging" of the American learner will also force a greater equalitarianism. More and more, those seeking post-secondary education will be not-so-young adults. The culture of the learner will be one of

self-direction; faculty will become facilitators, companions in the learning process more than masters of it.

Another equalitarian shift will come from developments many educators now find abhorrent. Follow the logic. Education, like health and many of the services, is capable of infinite demand—conceivably, the United States could spend its entire gross national product on satisfying this demand. Also, the services—far more than manufacturing—are prone to rising costs and inflation. All of which has forced education out of the isolation it had enjoyed (nonpartisan, self-justifying) into the arena of politics and public choice. Legislators and taxpayers are now asserting their right to make decisions formerly reserved to educators. And in that competitive environment, elitism will have a hard time surviving.

To this political intrusion, must be added the judicial. Educational processes and decisions, formerly carried out *in camera*, are now being subjected to judicial review. Due process is no longer what educators say it is; for better or worse—certainly moving toward egalitarianism—fair admissions, discipline, and the rest will be what the courts decide them to be.

Stated positively, then, the present ferment in education is leading toward increasing access at all levels and in a market-oriented, hence more egalitarian setting.

As ETS's own market orientation is indicating (from selective testing to diagnostic and "encouragement" testing), we will move away from a posture of including only a selected few, toward expanding and extending opportunities for learning.

I welcome the shift, though I sometimes shudder at the prospect of living through all the political and academic battles and readjustments that surely lie ahead.

But I don't see a learning—and better—society emerging or surviving without going through that sometimes agonizing metamorphosis.

STATE PLANNING FOR QUALITY EDUCATION

Russell W. Peterson

Let me thank you for the opportunity to share some thoughts with you on a topic which I view as extremely important to the future of our society.

I want to talk about education and its relationship to rewarding careers. But this needs qualifying and sharpening. I know that education, or learning, means more than simply going to school. Learning begins almost immediately for the infant, and most of us continue to learn throughout our lives. I also know that a satisfying and rewarding career doesn't simply mean a well-paying job which gives a person a sense of accomplishment. It can mean any kind of activity which produces the feeling of accomplishment, a feeling that you haven't wasted your time or your life.

Each of us knows people with little formal training who are enjoying very happy and satisfying careers. We also know others with much formal training who are miserable.

Altogether too many people fail to find a career that brings the happiness we all pursue. Somehow our schools must do a better job of helping to solve this problem. We spend more and more on our schools, yet there is little evidence that we get more for our money. Are we really educating young men and women to live meaningful lives? Although our high school and college campuses are "quiet" now, and although drug usage appears to be losing its popularity among many of our young people, we cannot deny the fact that schools don't automatically make people good and happy citizens.

Let's look at our educational institutions more closely. We possess the technical knowledge and capacity to meet the educational needs of the mentally retarded person, of the genius, and of almost everyone in between. From individual teaching machines to mass educational television, from programmed instruction to chartering jets for field trips, from push button calculators to computers—an ever-increasing stream of aids is available to our educational operation.

But we're not succeeding adequately. We have conducted countless studies and published reams of reports concerning the attitude of the child, his home, and his environment. We have also had important studies on our schools. The Coleman Report tells us that the "output" of our schools has little relationship to the "input." Coleman says that the public

schools–or the process of education itself–are not the social equalizers American society imagined them to be. His study showed that children achieved more or less in relation to family background and social class, and these were the variables that would have to be changed.

The Jencks Report tells us that schools don't do much in the way of dealing with the problems and disabilities of the disadvantaged. The Rand Corporation carried out in 1971, for the President's Commission on School Finance, a study of the effectiveness of education. The results showed that the conventional wisdom that more money for education will get more results is highly questionable. The study concluded that

> No variant of the existing system is consistently related to students' educational outcomes. Research has found nothing that consistently and unambiguously makes a difference in student outcomes. Increasing expenditures on traditional educational practices is not likely to improve educational outcomes substantially.

These reports as well as many others raise the following questions in our minds:

- What is the role of the school system in preparing us for life?
- Is it the primary influence?
- Or is it just one link in an extensive educational system that operates around the clock from the cradle to the grave in the home, in the neighborhood, throughout the broad community, in the schools, through television and radio, on the job, and so on?
- If it is the latter, are we allocating our resources properly in helping our young people to get launched properly in life?
- Should we establish educational brokers who would be concerned with the whole educational system, not just the schools, and who would help our young people make effective use of the whole system?
- Who should these brokers be–counselors employed by the community–or parents–or both?

There is much talk about accountability in education these days. And rightly so. The pioneering work in this area by Educational Testing Service has had a major impact. The Education Commission of the States' large-scale federally funded educational assessment program is one of the most noteworthy efforts.

This assessment measures the knowledge acquired in several subject

areas at a number of age levels. It should over the years provide an increasingly valuable tool for determining the relative success of students in learning. It should help to weigh the effectiveness of different teaching methods and of different school systems. And several states and school districts are developing other promising accountability techniques.

But it seems to me that another important measure of the effectiveness of education would be its success in helping people find satisfying and rewarding careers, in helping them in their pursuit of happiness.

Certainly the educational establishment is not the sole agency responsible for the success or failure of a student in finding a happy life, just as it is not the sole agent in determining how much knowledge a student acquires.

But the educational establishment does, and can to a much greater extent, play an important role in launching students toward the progressive realization of worthy goals. This is the key to happiness.

Therefore, I recommend that a measurement of educational effectiveness be developed that weighs the following factors:

1. the individual's personal assessment of his satisfaction with life
2. his success in acquiring satisfying employment
3. his alienation
4. his boredom
5. his participation in the community
6. his willingness to remain in the school system (i.e., not be a dropout)
7. his ability to live within the law
8. his knowledge and intellectual competence

In the April 2, 1973 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Lloyd J. Averill wrote:

> There is a peculiar irony—perhaps even a fundamental anachronism—at the very center of our academic enterprise. The irony becomes evident to anyone who compares the statement of educational purposes near the front of the (college) catalogue, customarily couched in terms glowing with human expectation, with the statement of graduation requirements somewhat farther back, customarily couched in terms of various arithmetic accumulations and averages.
>
> There may be a human profile lurking somewhere amidst the grade-point averages and hours to be accumulated, but its image is very dim indeed.

He points out that the graduation requirements have a powerful impact on teachers and students, shaping their efforts and anticipations away from human values. The measures "call the tune and determine institutional character."

He calls on us to bring our collective imagination to bear on devising measures that are human and humane.

The Executive Dean of Georgetown College in Kentucky, Thomas E. Corts, has called for colleges to become more consumer-minded. Rather than bill their "level of excellence" in terms of the number of volumes in the library, the percentage of Ph.D.'s on the faculty, the student-teacher ratio, the competence of the football team, and so on, colleges should emphasize the quality of their teaching. While business is highly sensitive to the quality of the product it sells, and establishes extensive quality control programs to insure good customer satisfaction, our educational institutions provide little evidence that they are sufficiently consumer conscious.

Let me discuss three general approaches that I believe will help improve the effectiveness of our education efforts.

First, we have to accept for ourselves and then pass on to our young people the fact that, in order to survive, you can't just exist, you have to do *something*. Every man and woman has to have some activity that produces in him some sense of satisfaction. For most of us, that means a good job—not necessarily well-paying and full of status and prestige, but a job that is satisfying. Many students feel that jobs aren't worth having. Worse, many know that they can't get jobs. These people are in the same spot as most residents of our correctional institutions. They sit and waste their time, feeling useless, and soon feeling hopeless.

So the first approach is to insist, loudly and clearly, that there is nothing wrong with work. Here we have to begin at home. I am convinced that the first five years of a child's life affect his attitude and ability to learn more than the subsequent twelve years of formal education. Perhaps we can adjust the environment at home to develop the attitude desired to promote the earning-a-living philosophy. The elementary grades should provide introductory exposure to this world of work.

Second, we have to accept for ourselves and pass on to our young people the fact that it doesn't matter what kind of job you get, as long as it is right for you. To me this is a very important point. We have done a great deal of damage to ourselves as a nation by saying that, to get a good job, you have to go to the best school you can and get the best marks in the best college preparatory courses. The best students are, therefore, seen

to be those who go on to college, or from college on to law or medical or graduate school to get advanced degrees which, so the argument runs, will get them jobs with big salaries.

The trouble with this argument is that it leaves out most of the people who go to school. For one reason or another, the majority don't take English composition, don't run the high school newspaper, don't take the College Boards (or, if they do, perform badly), don't win scholarships, and don't go on to professional schools. In other words, most of the people in our schools don't meet our standard of success. Therefore, they feel like losers. And, because of our standard of success, they are treated like losers. If you're a C-minus student in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades, it's doubtful that you'll do much better later on, especially if you're poor. The best students are singled out, and the rest are programmed as second- or third-best. It should come as no surprise that most of the people in our schools come to behave like losers. We've been reading about the results of this behavior for the last 10 years.

Therefore, we've got to rid ourselves of the idea that only certain kinds of jobs are worthwhile. We've got to rid ourselves of the feeling that a "vocational" job is "second-best." We've got to get past the "blue-collar–white-collar" way of thinking. Otherwise, failure will remain built into our educational system. We have to stop putting a premium on only certain kinds of work and admit that there is a premium to every kind of work. If we expect to be believed when we say "It is respectable to work," then we have to believe that all legal kinds of work are respectable.

The practical result of this kind of admission will be an educational system which will take care of the needs of everyone. By this I mean that we have to work harder at individualized counseling and training. We have examples of tremendous success in this area. Everyone here, I am sure, knows of some examples. We have some great examples in Delaware, where I served a term as Governor. I would like to talk briefly about two of them.

One is about a young student in her freshman year in high school. She had great difficulty, rebelled against the system, organized students against the establishment, refused to pledge allegiance to the flag, and got kicked out of her homeroom. This young student was signed up half-days in a neighboring vocational school. With the right advice and right teaching, she responded beautifully and became not only the leader of her class and a leader in our state, but is now a leader nationally. She is now an influence for good both to kids and adults.

I remember three years ago when I gave her the award for outstanding

student of the year. How excited I was about it! How excited the kids were! But the next day her teacher from her regular high school called the principal of the vocational school and asked of him, "How dare you give that girl that award! Don't you know she hasn't been allowed in her homeroom because she wouldn't pledge allegiance to the flag?"

"That's strange," the principal said, "she's been pledging allegiance to the flag here for three years, and what's more, last night she led the whole group in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag, including the Governor. When was it she wouldn't pledge the flag in your school?"

"Well, that was three years ago."

What a sad commentary on the one hand, but what a success story on the other.

Another story is about a young lad who had gotten in trouble for playing with drugs. After he was busted the second time, he gave up on school, saying, "It's no place for me." The story might have ended here except that he was offered a half-day opportunity at a vocational school. Today this former drug user is a leader in drug abuse clinics and a national president of a leading national organization.

Michelangelo said, "In every piece of marble there is a great statue waiting to be released." I say every school, every family, every community has great human beings waiting to be released. We must work hard to release their great potential.

The third step differs from the second because it involves a change in procedures, not a change in our minds. It is not an easy step, but it is easily expressed: We have to take on the obligation of finding a job for everyone who wants one. If we can sell our young people on the idea that work is respectable, and if we can sell ourselves on the idea that *all* legal kinds of work are respectable, then we have to make sure that work is available. We already go part way down this road with high school and college counseling and placement services. But what we need is guaranteed placement.

By guaranteed placement I don't mean just the guarantee of *a* job for anyone who wants one. Instead, the job has to have some relation to the individual's qualifications and training. There has to be some systematic attempt to match job qualification with job availability. Without this kind of guarantee, we may just make the problem worse than it already is by raising hopes and enthusiasm yet being unable to deliver.

We also know that even superb and extensive training doesn't guarantee one a job. Look what happened in the last 15 years in the aerospace industry. First, there was a hurry-up demand for scientists and engineers.

Then there was a boom, with full employment and only insignificant manpower shortages. Then came the glut—too many scientists and engineers without jobs. The same thing is happening to graduate students in the humanities. Under the National Defense Education Act we turned out thousands of Ph.D.'s each year. Now we are in a crisis of overproduction. And the same thing may be happening to the legal profession.

In my opinion, satisfying jobs are also a key solution to the welfare problem, to rehabilitating offenders, and to reducing alienation among our people.

Irving Kristol has written that the social welfare programs which have worked best are those that have been applied universally regardless of income. Social security and education are two examples. Public assistance grants, on the other hand, have been applied only to the very poor, causing a major irritation to those workers whose income is slightly higher than the cutoff level for welfare assistance.

In the case of jobs, one of the most critical social welfare needs, just the opposite is true. Our system provides jobs readily and generously to those at the top of the scale of income and skill and fails to provide jobs to those at the bottom. We need to make jobs universally acceptable. When the free enterprise system does not have sufficient job openings, government should make up the deficit.

Our educational system can help toward this objective by sufficient career choices and appropriate counseling to see that everyone who leaves school does so with either a job offer or an acceptance to another institution of learning.

One of the most exciting things occurring in education is the growth of the student youth organizations—groups such as V.I.C.A., D.E.C.A., F.H.A., and F.F.A. They are bringing about healthy changes and are helping to reduce the disparity between what society needs and what our schools are producing. They are turning young people on with a career instead of with drugs or delinquency.

I see this movement as a counterpart to what is happening in the industrial world. Industry, accustomed to change, is responding to the changing needs of its employees. The relationships between management and labor are undergoing a revolution. The workers are being involved in planning and in managing and are being organized so as to provide flexibility and variability in assignments.

This is not only upgrading job satisfaction but also increasing overall efficiency, productivity, and earnings for both employees and owners.

In the case of the student organizations, similar things are happening,

especially when the school administration and the teachers have wholeheartedly joined the cause.

Let me quote from a recent report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education:

> These vocational youth organizations, whose membership is voluntary, are quietly doing more to close the relevance gap than any other movement on the educational scene.
>
> The work of these organizations is integral to career education. They are by no means a frivolous and optional extracurricular activity. Students are *deeply* involved at every stage. The organizations provide an indispensable emphasis on career and civic awareness, social competence and leadership ability. Few who have witnessed the work of these organizations at first hand question their value as essential instruments in career education. Their activities are characterized by a contagious kind of zest and enthusiasm all too rare in educational endeavors.

But in too many schools the administration and the teachers fight this movement or at most give it lip service. I strongly recommend that government, industry, and education leaders tune in on this major development and work together to extend it through all of our secondary schools and colleges.

Now, let me summarize my remarks.

We have a crisis in education. Just pouring more money into our schools is not going to correct it. We need to make some changes. It will help if we recognize that our schools are only part of the educational system and shouldn't be expected to do the job alone.

One of our prime needs in life is to to have satisfying and rewarding careers. By measuring the performance of a school in helping students to fulfill this need, we will probably make more headway than by concentrating on test scores and grade-point averages.

All legal kinds of work are respectable and can provide satisfying employment. A plumber is as good as a parson. A good objective for our school system is to see that everyone who leaves school does so with a job offer or an acceptance to another institution of learning.

Since it does little good to train and motivate a person for a job unless such a job is available, it is essential that jobs be provided for everyone. Student organizations in partnership with perceptive teachers and administrators are demonstrating how we can rejuvenate our schools and improve their effectiveness.

Education is still the lifeblood of our society. This will be even more true in the decades ahead. You and I must understand it, nurture it, and help it to change to fulfill the growing needs of man.

NIE AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Thomas K. Glennan, Jr.

I propose to talk about NIE and its mandate, to talk briefly about where we are, and about the extraordinary complexity and difficulty of the task of bringing about, within NIE or within any research activity, a set of programs that really can bring about effective learning in America.

In fact, the Institute's mandate makes it very clear that we have responsibilities with respect to educational reform in this country. It is very clear that the National Institute of Education is not to be concerned primarily with basic research, but rather with attempts to bring about broad educational reforms. To be sure, the Institute is to carry out activities that strengthen the technological and scientific base of education and improve our understanding of learning, but I think the legislative history, as well as the mandate within the law itself, suggests that reform and improvement of educational practices constitute our major mission.

The means by which we carry this out, of course, are extremely varied. We are to undertake developmental programs that result in materials or program designs which can be used in school districts across the country. We are to carry out fundamental research that improves our understanding of what should go into those programs and materials, and we are to have a responsibility for the development of an effective R & D system. As to an effective R & D system, I think Congress made it very clear that our concern is to be not only with carrying out research and development but also with how the results of this research and development come to be used within the classroom. The bulk of our activities will surely be concerned with elementary and secondary education, as has been the case of our predecessors in the Office of Education. But we will have significant activities, I think, in the higher education area, as well as some activities in early childhood. By and large, I think that if we have not made some impact on the effectiveness of schooling in the future, the Institute will not have fulfilled its mandate.

Our legislation also makes clear that one of the important aspects of what we mean by effectiveness in schooling is the question of equality of opportunity to obtain a quality education for all citizens of this country. Thus, we have a dual mandate involving both the quality of education and the equality of opportunity to obtain it.

In the first few months since I have been at the Institute, we have been carrying out activities inherited from the Office of Education; our budget for this fiscal year—about $110 million—was made up largely of programs and activities that originated at the Office of Education. We have been reviewing each program or project to sharpen our definitions of what they intend to do or clarify the agreements between ourselves, researchers and developers, and school systems as to what they are doing—in some instances actually terminating activities which seem not to be making a significant contribution. The consequence of that preoccupation, and the fact that we have yet to complete our staff, has been less forward planning than I would like to have had at this point in time.

Let me briefly review these programs we inherited. Career education, a major initiative within the Office of Education, came to us in the form of four major model developments: school, home, industry, and residential-based programs. We have been trying to understand what career education is and to narrow the traditionally broad definition to something a bit more workable for research planning. We have also tried to define a few priority target groups our efforts are intended to affect. It has been suggested that both children and parents have something to gain from career education, and that may be so. But, we do not think *we* can be relevant to all such groups simultaneously. So we are going to focus on two groups: First, the youth who are frequently disaffected with secondary schools or perhaps unhappy with the offerings of postsecondary education. That group, which seems to us to pose a significant problem for society, also seems likely to benefit from career education. The second group, of increasing interest from a policy point of view, is the midcareer person. For example, this includes a housewife who wants to reenter the labor force, or perhaps a person who has found that he or she has reached a deadend in some job and would like to switch careers.

The relevance of education to the activities of both groups is not yet totally clear to me. Particularly in the case of the midcareer person, the problems are not just those of education, not just those involving the absence of skills or knowledge that would help in a new job. There are also the problems associated with the nature of our labor markets, the nature of society as a whole.

The issues of career switch and the issues of reentry into the labor force are bound up, it seems to me, in the ways in which our union agreements operate, in which labor markets internal to individual firms operate, and in which racism and sexism affect our society. If we, in fact, set as our objective simply the provision of education, we're surely going to have

another educational failure on our hands. Our program will do something a little new in the educational research area; it will try to look at the environment in which education takes place, the environment which people enter when they leave school, and the environment that affects midcareer job decisions, as well as the education process itself.

Another major program inherited from the Office of Education is the experimental schools. This is not a very clearly articulated area in terms of a narrow set of goals, but, I think, underlying the program is a very significant set of concerns. One of them is the notion that too much of what we have tried to do in the past in education reform has been piecemeal and isolated: It has not worried about what happens to the child during and after he or she leaves that particular demonstration project; about the changes needed within a school system in order to make that project a success; or about mechanism, needed to make the project self-renewing. Experimental schools attempt to deal with comprehensive change within a system, to involve all parties within a community in that change, and to see, for instance, whether, through a five-year federal commitment, the school system can bring about significant reform which does in fact continue after the monies stop.

A third set of inherited programs are a number of projects initiated by the regional laboratories and R & D centers. These are varied in nature, including curriculum development activities, teacher-training programs, research on educational administration, and so forth. The labs' and centers' 68 programs have been reviewed and are being supported on an individual project purchase basis. In the past, the labs and centers received institutional support. This will not continue; instead, the labs and centers will have to compete with other bidders for NIE support of specific projects.

The fourth area that we have continued, although in a significantly different fashion, is the field-initiated studies or the research grants program. The Institute held its first competition this spring and was literally innundated by the response to it. In June we will announce approximately 200 grants and contracts for fairly fundamental, basic research in education and learning. We used a panel structure for rendering advice on selections with extraordinary support from the research community.

And, finally, we inherited a major activity in dissemination, an activity that I want to come back to in a few minutes.

All of these activities are, if you will, in the past. We are trying to be responsible in completing them, trying to see that we get as much as

possible from the investment that the government has made in these activities. But the real question concerns the future. I gave an example in the career education case of some attempt to look forward and to try to isolate a set of problems on which to focus.

But we have a lot of other areas to explore, so we have created an important new organizational structure within the Institute to convey our concern about the way we carry out research and development. We will have an Office of Research and Development Programs, which will carry out major activities suggested by planning activities within a second office, called the Office of Research and Exploratory Studies. This set of planning activities will involve, in some instances, several years of work both inside and outside the Institute and consultation with practitioners, researchers, and policy makers at many different levels. My conviction is that, too often in the past, social science research in general and educational research in particular failed to think through the problems it is trying to deal with. What methods are likely to produce results that will be convincing to the people involved in decision making about educational services? Those kinds of questions simply have not been considered in many of our activities. In fact, even now, many programs administered by the Institute have not been sufficiently oriented toward dissemination needs. Talk to almost any major developer and ask him about his plans for getting information about his project to somebody who can use it; I am afraid you will be disappointed.

We have a long way to go in the matter of starting to think about how to set up exploratory studies groups. How *do* you organize your planning effort? What kinds of people do you involve? How do you involve them? It is really a very chastening experience.

How can I illustrate the immense problems ahead of us? For just a moment let us think about the many different ways we can look at a problem, the problem of the "disadvantaged" child. We can begin with the idea that somehow what goes on in a classroom is most significant, is going to affect what and how a youngster learns, and, therefore, what we really need to do is develop a new program or a set of materials that will improve what goes on in the classroom. But, as one goes through that process, one discovers that materials and curricula are not sufficient. They may not in many cases even be necessary to establish a good classroom environment.

So we move to the notion that it is the teachers who are important, who are the key and who really affect a child's learning. The immediate response is to say: Let's have a creative teacher-training program; or we need more in-service training; or, we need more relevant training. But

we're beginning to recognize, I think, that there are many different kinds of teachers, just as there are many different kinds of learning styles. One kind of teacher will not be good for all children, will not be effective with all children; therefore we have to find ways in which to match, in some fashion, teachers with students.

Such a recognition forces us to be concerned with the problems of organization in a school building. How can you bring about that kind of matching, how can you make sure that if you're wrong in the first assignment there are ways of correcting this? So, maybe we ought to be doing research on the problems of school management and the problems of finding the kinds of principals and education leaders within school buildings who can effectively make those matches. And no matter what, we still have problems because we don't have as many good teachers as we ought to have.

This leads us to another set of problems: the selection of teachers by the school systems, the means by which teachers "select" themselves into teaching, and the reasons that induce good teachers to leave the system. This is a kind of systematic concern: How do we get better people in the teaching profession, and how do you keep them there? We have some knowledge about this matter; we know something about what to do but, somehow, there is something within the system that frustrates our attempts to select the right teachers or the right materials or to make the right assignments. The frustration leads us to seek ways to change the system which in turn leads to a new set of problems: What, indeed, are the most effective systems of governance, what are the impacts of governance structures, different kinds of people, or different people in different roles, making different classes of decisions?

But maybe none of this matters. Perhaps, as some suggest, schools contribute only a part of everything that has to do with education, that instead much of education takes place in the home or in community institutions. We really ought to attempt to look at the effects of the home and the community on learning. And, looking a little further than that, maybe education isn't our problem after all. Maybe it is the system into which educated people are being placed that causes the problems. Maybe we really need to concentrate on the behavior of institutions in general and the labor market in particular. Finally, maybe we are just wrong in the goals we expect education to achieve!

These are not mutually exclusive definitions of the problems associated with educating the disadvantaged in any given community; many or all of these factors are part of the problem. But science has a tendency to

require that problems be torn apart. Researchers are only trained to deal with parts of the problem. Communicating among research personnel of differing disciplines is nearly impossible. Yet if we are to deal with the problems of the disadvantaged, the Institute must find ways to deal with all of these problems simultaneously.

This listing may give some sense of dealing with the complexities of one major problem. But of course, everybody has a somewhat different set of priorities and a different perspective. What I am concerned about in education is somewhat different, I suspect, than what you're concerned about. I believe in individual freedom and a chance for every youngster and his parents to choose the kind of education most attractive to them. That may conflict fairly significantly with the views of other people who argue that the system has a responsibility to provide a common set of skills and knowledge. The Institute must have some relevance to both of us.

We have a terrible difficulty, finally, in dealing with anything outside very concrete individual situations; yet the essence of research is to try to find some kinds of generalities. You may note that when I talk about the things we're doing, I almost always talk in terms of individual cases and that I have difficulty in trying to find things that have or can be generalized. That's another problem, it seems to me, that faces the Institute.

These observations give some sense of the complexities of choosing and defining research problems. Let me turn for a moment to ask who does the problem solving, for I have been talking as though we in the Institute were going to solve problems and that's really not quite right. The problems will not be solved in Washington, in most instances, I suspect, not even at the state level, but rather, at the local level. That's where most of the decisions are made; that's where the people who implement decisions are and I don't think that's going to change. I don't think it can change. Obviously substantial power exists at the state level but, undoubtedly, without local impetus and support, little can be accomplished.

If the education and client communities at the local levels do not seek out the kinds of work the Institute does, we will have very little impact. We can have some impact on policy makers at the federal level, upon finance, and so on (and that's not unimportant) but with respect to what goes on in the classroom, we will have very little effect.

So, what is there left for the Institute to do? Well, we can provide partial solutions. We can aspire to provide materials, some ideas about consequences of alternative forms of governance. We can try to reduce the risk to local school systems of major systemic changes by at least providing some examples in various communities across the country of attempts to

effect change, so that people can observe it, can guess at the consequences for their own communities. And, as I say, we can do some very significant policy research, affecting decisions at the federal level and at state levels on such issues as educational finance, measurement, and so forth.

But the view that reform impetus has to come from the local level leads us to a very significant policy problem within the Institute: How do we encourage consumers and educators at the local level to search for solutions? And, then, how do we in fact find what kinds of problems they are dealing with, the ways in which they are dealing with them, the way that we can provide some kind of realistic help? A recognition of the importance of this problem leads us to one of the major activities within the Institute now, a large staff study dealing with the dissemination process and with what we're calling intermediaries. We are concerned with trying to find bridges, frequently locally-based organizations, that can help in problem solving at the local level. We suspect such organizations will contribute to the problem solving. We are trying to reach out to the places where that research is being done.

Perhaps this is enough. I think you can see that there's a tremendous challenge here. I think it's an exciting challenge. I personally believe that we can make some headway or I wouldn't be here. But I hope I've impressed you with the fact that it's going to be awhile; it's going to take an awful lot of searching around. We are going to need your support, the support of practitioners and researchers, of policy makers and citizens generally, to make that headway.